

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1179100 | Resident | Incredibly comprehensive document overall, however, what, if any, weight will be afforded by the Inspectorate in the matter of Appeals? It seems that even when BDC uphold their policies, the Appeal system overrules negating the policy in place. Further, what specific protection is being given to usable agricultural land and finally, how can the figures for rural growth be ratified with developments already granted since 2018. They do not marry up in some villages. Generally, a well thought out document with a bit of blue sky thinking in places, but clearly one intended to improve the economy and growth of the district. | Once the Local Plan is completed and is considered "sound" by the inspector, it will provide the opportunity for the Council to have an up-to-date Local Plan that is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore affords full weight in local decision making. When that occurs, it will mean that the Council will have more power to make decisions that are supported by the most up-to-date policy. Rural monitoring has been updated to make it clearer which development contributes to the rural growth. |
| 1180212 | Resident | Lound residents has been working over the last 3 years (probably longer) to gather and analyse evidence, hold public consultations and other meetings in preparation for the submission of a Lound Neighbourhood Plan to Bassetlaw Council. Their work has been marked by a careful approach, retaining the confidence of residents, especially in the allocation of sites for new housing. Clear and what was regarded as secure information about the location of development sites has been circulated to village residents. The Plan is scheduled to be submitted to Bassetlaw Council in the next 2 weeks. The work completed has now been placed into question by a near doubling of Lound's target for new housing (42). The criterion used by Bassetlaw to calculate the new target is crude, taking no account of, for example, residents' views of the character of the village and adequacy of its existing amenities, transport links, the density of present housing provision together with the gain from large developments planned on North Road, for example, or any other important criteria. It seems that the government has set a target that Bassetlaw is chasing without regard for the implications in small rural communities. In Lound, this means that the work undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Committee including, crucially, residents' views about the type of housing wanted and where it should be located, has been cast into the air Confidence in Bassetlaw's approach to policymaking and their understanding of the time and difficulties of drawing up a Neighbourhood Plan has been diminished. It would be appreciated if Bassetlaw Council would not immediately enforce the new target for Lound, complicating the good work achieved so far. Sites for 21 houses, have been identified by Lound residents and placed in the Lound Draft Neighbourhood Plan. This is a sizeable number in a village that is basically organised around two roads, Town Street and Little Top Lane. If the character of either of these locations is changed by the needless imposition of new targets, damage will be done to the character of the village and to its residents. Please remove the obligation for Lound to revise its Neighbourhood plan, finalised within the last month. One approach would be to reassess progress with Lound's existing plan in 5 years' time. At that time, it would be possible to assess if new targets are necessary. Economic growth in Bassetlaw, population movements into or out of the area, whether sites like North Road have provided enough houses in line with overall need, and other important subjects could then be considered. That strategy would allow time for needed adjustments and avoid the present doubling of village targets when Lound has undertaken what was required by the Council in the very recent past. An alternative, practical solution is for Bassetlaw's overall small settlement target to be pooled. The inflated target for Lound could then be reallocated to villages wanting more development than their revised quota permits. That would be a fair and just way of developing an alternative policy, returning Lound to its original, planned target. Lound will deliver 21 new homes. To now require the village to develop sites for 42 houses just as a plan for 21 has been agreed is unwise and a policy that should be revised urgently. | Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1185614 | Resident | The increase from 10% requirement to 20% cap is a considerable increase for small rural settlements. For villages such as Lound this means an increase from 21 to 42. This increase will change the character of the village and undermines the views and wishes of the villagers as identified in the draft neighbourhood plan. Small rural settlements vary in size considerably, there is need for further consideration on the demands of a one cap fits all. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1188560 | Resident | The housing requirement increase from 10% to 20% is too many and that Bassetlaw's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. I propose that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fairer result. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1189264 | Resident | One of the redeeming features of bassetlaw, particularly the north east section are its rural villages and communities as apposed to the poorly thought out and ugly urban centers like Worksop. People often move to these areas to escape the urban sprawl, over crowding and ugly new builds. It therefore seems counter productive to encourage new developments in these areas, simply to maintain the population. Simple solution; encourage more small businesses in the area, entrepreneurs etc and you will soon find people moving back into these rural villages to escape the rat race. | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |
| 1189654 | Resident | Lound is a small rural village designated as an SRS. To double its housing requirement to 20%, 42 in total clearly is not necessary and this is demonstrated in BDC's own figures. Our infrastructure would not support such a large increase and would cause environmental issues that go against a number of the aims of the Draft Local Plan. Infrequent public transport which makes car usage necessary, a high volume of HGV traffic through the village to Charcon Industires and the Anaerobic Digestion Plant from early morning and through out the day, inadequate drainage systems which even now lead to flooding of some properties are but some of the existing problems the village faces. An increase as suggested of 20% is totally unfair on this village. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1189633 | Resident | <p>I have noticed that you state the requirement for houses in small rural settlements is 1090. Your allocation of 20% to each settlement means that you have increased your requirement (if that is what it is) by over 1,000 houses. There is no explanation for this increase which, to say the least, is unfortunate and surely the cause of confusion. This 'discrepancy', however, allows flexibility and the reallocation of housing numbers from village to village. Small villages that wish to remain small (there can be no objection to having small villages in Bassetlaw) should be permitted to transfer some extra numbers to settlements that want more than a 20% increase of housing numbers. If settlements wanting more than 20% are allocated extra numbers and others accept the 20% rise there is surely flexibility to leave Lound's commitment to 21 houses (a figure arrived at after 4 years of difficult work) to remain as its allocation. That would allow you to deliver your requirement of 1090 and probably more. After such a long period of sustained work I think it is very unfair to raise Lound's allocation. We do not have the infrastructure for 42 houses. Car numbers would be increased meaning an increase in CO2 emissions, which is in conflict with the national planning policy that places sustainability as one of its 3 main principles. Bassetlaw's increases of 20% to each village is surely in conflict with its objective of sustainability. Villages do not have shops and other facilities. Each household is likely to have 2 cars and an increase of houses means a very large increase in journeys to towns with required facilities. This is undesirable.</p> | <p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledge the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p> |
| 1189633 | Resident | <p>Currently face the joint existential threats of climate and biodiversity collapse. Hoping to see a plan which reflected the need for housing to be located in areas which minimise the need to travel and maximise the ability to make trips by sustainable modes of transport. Highlight this in your plan, along with the fact that you wish to develop higher densities of development in the most accessible sites. See a lazy approach of just adding 20% to all rural settlements, with apparently little or no thought as to the points above. I live in Lound, and as a committed environmentalist I can confirm that it is impossible to travel effectively outside of the village for work (where you have to arrive not wet and not muddy) without use of a private car. Therefore, the placing of an additional 42 homes within the village will increase car travel in the district significantly. Challenge that this is in direct opposition to your aims of ST45. Our infrastructure would not support this volume of extra homes. Assuming, from the lack of care given to this process, that you have not visited Lound. Had you done so, you would know that in a number of places the road through our village is single track, so unable to support an increase in traffic. Our sewerage system is over capacity with the current number of homes. Support the construction of a small number of homes within Lound, if they were built to the highest possible environmental standards, and certainly should not be built with fossil fuel heating systems.</p> | <p>The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1189746 | Residents | Concerned that the Plan has changed so dramatically. We believe that this will have an extremely negative effect on our village, LOUND. We understand that the Housing Requirement for small local communities has doubled from 10% to 20% but that that Bassetlaw's own figures do not support the need for this substantial increase. For our village specifically this means an increase from 21 more houses, which was accepted by our parish council, to a total of 42 houses. The impact of this on the village will be substantial. An increase of 42 houses is likely to result in 84 more cars since the bus service is infrequent and expensive. The local plan emphasises the need for small starter homes but the cost of any home in this village would be above the starter home price band. The roads in and out of the village are poorly maintained and Chainbridge Lane is already subject to frequent heavy commercial traffic to Charcon and the autodigester at Sutton Grange. The main village street, Town Street, is very narrow with narrow pavement. Street parking already causes problems for buses, agricultural vehicles etc. There are no facilities in the village apart from a public house so residents have to travel for all amenities ie. schools, shops, medical care etc. Welcome new residents to the village, especially young ones, to increase the diversity of the population but it must be on a sustainable basis, in proportion to the overall infrastructure of the village as it is at present. | The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%. |
| 1189759 | Resident | See that each small rural settlement which includes Lound had had its housing requirement doubled from 10% to 20%. Where has this figure come from and how can it be justified in such a small village. In Sutton cum Lound many of the new properties are not selling so in my opinion demand is not there! How can the villages small infrastructure support 40+ properties. It was challenging enough for 20 I would refrain from this and revert back to 10% which might just meet the needs of the local area. Other villages where they are building are not selling so supply is greater than demand coupled with the increased environmental impact on our villages and others | The majority of housing growth is being allocated to the main settlements where there is the supporting services and facilities. However, Bassetlaw is a largely rural District and many of our communities are small and have few services. In some of these locations there is a need for accommodation and employment and the Local Plan is providing a strategy that will support a proportionate level of growth subject to its size and level of existing services. Communities across the District are also developing Neighbourhood Plans to manage their growth in a way that will benefit them. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement" but the percentage of growth has been reduced to 5%. |
| 1190131 | Resident | Not happy about the fact that the housing requirements has doubled from 10% to 20%.As a village we were quite prepared to look for a 10% increase but 20% will totally alter the character of the village. People move to a village because they want a small close knit community and don't expect to see this increase by such a large amount. Although I would like to see housing for first time buyers and young families I am concerned that such a large increase of properties will overwhelm the school . I suggest the percentage be reduced to the original figure. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1190145 | Resident | Feel very strongly that the proposal to increase Lound's Housing Requirement from 10% to 20% is totally unacceptable. Our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Committee has worked with parishioners who have generally accepted the addition of 21 houses. However, doubling this number would be unsustainable as the infrastructure would not support the increase - drainage, public transport etc. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1190215 | Resident | It is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. I think this is too many and that Bassetlaw District Council's own figures suggest that this number is not required. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRS's be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their neighbourhood plan supports this according to local needs. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1190489 | Resident | Have followed the ongoing discussions and played an active part in meetings relating to the proposed development affecting our village, Lound. It is with significant concern that we have learned of the proposed changes, effectively doubling the housing requirement for the village. This appears to be a contradiction to the Council's own figures which demonstrate that this number is not required. We are particularly upset by the apparent lack of respect for the years of work done by the team of volunteers on behalf of Bassetlaw Council in establishing and developing Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Was all of this work completed in vain? Accepting the need to contribute to the wider development and supply of homes nationally, believe that from the evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years, there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) Cannot understand or accept that doubling this is realistic. Understand that the number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. Fail to identify how the village of Lound could support the revised target. Lound's infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has costly, infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and serves only to encourage increased dependency on private transport and defies the stated aim of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. A provision of smaller, starter homes is highly unlikely. Given the Council's Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that, for Large Rural Settlements, 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans. We would strongly suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF024 | Resident | It is unacceptable after the village steering group has undertaken a lot of work based on the councils original premise ,to then revise the local plan to basically double the number of houses expected to be built in Lound. It will significantly damage the way of village life and although we were willing to accept some change as inevitable,to double the numbers is unacceptable.please register my objection | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF031 | Residents | See that it is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. This is too many and that Bassetlaw District Council's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses(10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| | | to mitigate climate change. Do not have a school or shop to support a growth of 40 plus additional households. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. The requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result. | |
| REF032 | Residents | As a resident of Lound, Retford, express my strong objection to the housing requirement for Lound which is outlined in the above draft Plan. Over many years, our village Council and representatives have taken very seriously the responsibility to consult residents and formulate their views, latterly in specific response to the BDC Local Plan, January 2019. Evidence clearly indicated a general, if reluctant, acceptance of 21 new houses in line with the Plan. In less than 12 months, this has been doubled, contrary to all residents' opinions about the nature of requirements in their village, particularly ignoring the basis on which the draft Lound Neighbourhood Plan 2020 is based. Response to a Residents' Survey in 2016 clearly indicated that the people believed little, or indeed, no new housing was needed in Lound and that any development should be based on encouraging sustainable, low-cost housing for families and pensioners. If you genuinely do take resident views into effective account, it is clear that the new figure, in ST2 of the above Plan, of 42 new houses, is unsupportable, unfair and unrealistic. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF034 | Residents | See the housing requirements has now doubled from previous 10% to 20% this is far to many for a small village like lound. And would completely spoil the village. We have a very infrequent public transport to the village meaning new houses will depend on private transport. Would like no more than the 10% increase for the village off lound | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF038 | GPS Planning and Design ltd. | As Bassetlaw is predominantly a rural District, support the positive and proportionate distribution of housing growth spatial strategy approach to rural development advocated in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan. This seeks to deliver a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement over the Plan period for the Small Rural Settlements, with proportionate growth of 20% per Parish settlement. Welcome the encouragement given to Neighbourhood Planning Groups and the local communities to allocate sites to meet their housing requirement themselves. Agree that Scrooby should rightfully be included in the list of settlements contained in Policy ST2: Rural Bassetlaw where growth is supported. Whilst we concur that there should be minimum housing requirement set for each of the rural settlements, a precise quantum 'cap' for housing growth, in the case of Scrooby at 29 units, is far too restrictive. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Scrooby will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1190900 | Residents | Reluctantly agreed to accept the requirement of new housing in Lound, one of the designated small rural settlements, but the target for homes in the amended draft BDC plan has been doubled from 21 to 42 new homes. This will completely change the character of the village. It is also not feasible on the grounds of the limited infrastructure of the village i.e utilities such as power supply and drainage as well as limited public transport facilities. The number of houses envisaged is also an over-provision on the number stated in your own plan. This is not Nimby ism but common sense and in any case, surely the real need is for starter homes for young people which is unlikely to be needed in a small village. Surely , it also makes sense to use existing brown-field sites and not to further impinge upon greenfield areas unnecessarily ? With the continuing closure of factories and shops, couldn't buildings be converted and areas previously used for commerce be | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| | | utilized? Builders of course need an incentive to clean up such areas as it is currently cheaper for them to build on "virgin" land. Support the 10% increase but not the 20% increase in new homes. | |
| 1191130 | Residents | Having read the above plan ,,especially the requirement for SRS housing increase from 10% to 20% think that this is too much for Lound and that BDCs own figures show this increase is not required. The facts gathered by our Parish Council's neighbourhood Plan steering group over the past 4 years shows there is a general acceptance of 21 new homes(10%)but a doubling of this unsupportable.The number of houses required by your Draft plan is 1090 in the SRS category,yet the 20% requirement stated in ST2will provide2124 houses,a 100% over-provision. Your BRC states that many villages are already using the 20% requirement so there should be no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. The Lound infrastructure will not support such a large increase.The village bus service is infrequent and really unusable so any increase in families will have to depend on private transport The national average number of cars per household is 1.88 so therefor almost 80 more cars will be in Lound.This goes against the aim of DLP to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with the provision for more development if Neighbourhood plans support this according to local needs.This in my opinion would be much fairer. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1191848 | Barnby Moor Parish Council | A village the size of Barnby Moor to have an increase of 23 dwellings will mean these properties being built on good farm land. | Barnby Moor has remained a small rural settlement but the level of growth has been reduced to 5% dwellings in the revised version of local plan. |
| REF067 | GR Planning and Architectural Design Ltd | Support for Section 5.2 and Policy ST2. This identifies the importance of the contribution that new rural housing can make to the broader sustainability of villages and that all rural settlements have a role to play in achieving this objective. The draft policy is consistent with Government Guidance as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework that supports sustainable development that will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In recognition of the well established planning principle that any new development should respect the identity and distinctiveness of the settlement it is important to relate the size, scale, form and character of new development to that of the settlement in which it is located. In order to identify settlements that could accommodate new housing whilst satisfying these requirements the Councils Spatial Strategy 2019 assessed all 103 settlements in Rural Bassetlaw. Settlements that could not satisfy the identified requirements either because they were too small or too dispersed were not identified as being able to accommodate any new housing development and will be classified as being in the countryside. Styrrup is identified as a settlement that is capable of accommodating new housing development in accordance with the agreed principles. In order to protect rural settlements from excessive development that would not be proportionate to the size and scale of existing settlements and as a result would be harmful to local identity and distinctiveness the Draft Local Plan proposes that the amount of new housing development should be limited to 20% of the existing number of dwellings. There will be the opportunity for local communities to increase the percentage of growth through the inclusion of 'exceptions housing' referred to in the policy. This provides flexibility to allow the local community to choose how they plan for growth, with options to determine the most appropriate location and type of housing in accordance with the overall spatial strategy. The emphasis is therefore clearly on the need to make provision for the future controlled growth of rural settlements. Draft Policy ST2 entitled "Rural Bassetlaw" states that: C. Small Rural Settlements. Residential development in the Small rural settlements within the Parishes listed below, will, collectively accommodate a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement. Parish. Base number of dwellings 20% housing increase August 2018 in dwellings to 2037 Styrrup 131 26 D. Identifies 6 criteria that new housing development within Small Rural Settlements should satisfy: 1. Proposal should not increase number of dwellings by over 20% 2. Site should be within settlement boundary identified in Neighbourhood Plan - there is no Neighbourhood Plan for Styrrup. 3. A single proposal should not exceed 10 dwellings. 4. There should be no conflict with existing character and built form. 5. It should | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| | | not lead to coalescence with neighbouring settlements. 6. Must comply with Nottinghamshire Minerals local Plan. E. Deals with Rural Exceptions Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 is therefore supported and recognises National Planning Policy that aims to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is a positive policy that reflects a spatial growth strategy that should be commended. | |
| REF068 | Resident | Concerned by the proposals within the 2020 draft version of the Local Plan to target Small Rural Settlements (such as Lound) to increase their Housing Requirements to 20% of their current size. A target of 10% growth, as required by the 2019 draft, was feasible (though unpopular in Lound) but the higher figure is neither fair nor sustainable in many SRS. They simply do not have the infrastructure or suitable tracts of land to support your proposals without adverse effect. Would urge you to reword the emerging Local Plan to target 10% growth in SRS, though allowing flexibility to those communities which demonstrate a need for higher growth through their Neighbourhood Plans. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1192465 | Resident | Do not beleive that doubling requirements for SRS is sensible A, As per Bassetlaw plan its not required B, Local infastructure is not sufficient C, No areas big enough to support building of first affordable homes so we get more developments of large expensive homes that as seen in local villages do not sell. | The Local Plan has revised its settlement hierarchy for the rural Bassetlaw through Policy ST2. This policy has split the rural settlements into 3 tiers based on there size and the level of services and facilities. Growth has then been distributed accordingly. |
| REF082 | Residents | Lound, as a small community, is unusual in hosting two very traffic heavy industrial elements. The A.D. Plant at Walters' farm, while being a welcome addition to the generation of cleaner electricity, is also a very heavy road user. Tractor and trailer traffic, at the X roads heart of the village, is often continual. Leaving aside air pollution and noise this can represent a barrier to smooth traffic flow along Town Street. Additionally, the second site Charcon, which produces concrete products, also necessitates the passage of much lorry traffic. There is rarely a quiet period in any day, partly because this business is a significant employer and the enterprise generates a considerable amount of service traffic. Unsurprisingly most of the employees use cars to get to site. All this amounts to a noisy and busy village at its core X roads. Suggest this be properly surveyed to establish current road use before the proposed increase to 20% in your plan. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF084 | East Markham Parish Council | Object to Policy ST2 and ST2E. It is outrageous that the ST2 policy is rendered irrelevant by ST2E which allows for the 20 per cent growth limit to be set aside. There is considerable public disquiet in East Markham regarding damage being done by the overdevelopment of this village. And the current wave of house building of over 100 homes has barely even begun. Speaking as a Parish Councillor and someone with a 100 year family connection to East Markham, have never known a time when so many complaints - formal and informal - have been made about the state of our village. Object to any further growth in housing in East Markham. In the past 6 months East Markham has experienced ... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raw sewage on High Street pouring from public drains • Raw sewage on Church Street pouring from public drains • The months long and ongoing closure of Priestgate over the A1, increasing traffic problems in the village. There are no confirmed plans to ever reopen this vital entry/ exit road into the village • Multiple recent car crashes on Farm Lane, leading to the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing • The introduction of double yellow lines and announced plans for further double yellow lines in the village to deal with parking and traffic chaos. Double yellow lines in a village !!!!! • Repeated closure of Mark Lane, for days at a time, meaning that 2 of the 4 roads from the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing were closed • Severe parking/ congestion problems on Farm Lane leading to the Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing, especially at school drop/ collection times • Multiple residential addresses flooded on Low Street/ York Street • Agreement to increase the size of our primary school • Severe parking/ congestion issues adjacent to the primary school, already - which will only get worse Going back 20 years, East Markham used to have 4 main car routes in and out of the village - it now has just 2. More and more houses keep getting approved before the real world impact of 100 already approved/ under | East Markham has seen a significant level of growth over the past ten years - largely down to infilling and the redevelopment of existing sites such as the old poultry factory off Mark Lane. At the same time, the village has also lost some vital services and facilities. Since 1st April 2018, the level of planning permissions for homes have counted towards meeting the proposed growth figure for the village as identified in the Local Plan. The revised Local Plan has also reduced the level of growth in line with other small rural settlements and following responses from the previous public consultation to 5% |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| | | construction has even been experienced. Despite all this, there are no plans for any infrastructure improvements in East Markham whatsoever. Lives have been devastated by flooding. Fear that one of our traffic accidents will soon see serious harm done to a child. Over 100 new houses already have planning permission in East Markham. The Mark Lane/ Priestgate crossing will become profoundly dangerous when these new houses, the majority of which are clustered around this junction, are built. Unlike Worksop, East Markham has practically no social amenities. No supermarket, Dr, leisure centre, coffee shops, restaurants, youth clubs, library, hospital, car park, pedestrianised areas, proper bus service, sources of material numbers of jobs, taxi firm yet we now have dangerous congestion, chronic parking issues, residential flooding and sewage running in multiple streets. | |
| 1193046 | Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan | As a resident of LOUND, & a member of their Neighborhood Development Plan (NDP), am concerned about the proposed increase in the Housing Requirement (HR) for the Small Rural Settlements (SRS) being raised to 20%. Lound NDP worked in good faith on the 10% HR that was part of the dBLP 2019. Our consultation process has given us a yield of possible sites for new dwellings that hardly reaches 10%. Looking at your outline for SRS, BDC states that it needs 1090 new dwellings whereas the individual allocations village by village comes to 2124. So which is the operative figure? Does BDC have any idea as to the likely yield from these proposed HR allocations or is it simply a matter of "Hoping for the best?" In any case, you would do better to site your HR for Social housing nearer to the hubs that provide the services that these new residents will need. I am therefore against this proposed increase in the HR for SRS to 20%. Note on p36, in the section on Large Rural Settlements (LRS), there is a place for Neighbourhood Plans to play a role in deciding the how the HR is delivered. In the paragraph dealing with SRS, there is no such provision. PLEASE could you add such a clause making reference to NP as this would give BDC the necessary discretion to allocate more new dwellings to SRS that are planning for more, & those SRS such as Lound, which require much fewer new dwellings can have a lower figure. Would BDC consider organizing WORKSHOPS for SRS so that you can work out a consensus that better fits the varied requirements of all the different settlements. This would have the added bonus of allowing your stakeholders to better draft your plan with you, this would thus ensure that your are more likely to reach your overall target for new dwellings. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1193046 | Lound Neighbourhood Development Plan | Would BDC also consider developing the sites of Ranby Prep School & Eaton Hall also as sites for new housing developments? | No sites within Small Rural Settlements will be formally allocated for development in the Local Plan. However, Neighbourhood Plans can allocate sites for development at a local level if the community support proposals. |
| 1193061 | Resident | States that Neighbourhood Plans, once agreed have the same planning status as the Local Plan. In creating Lound's Neighbourhood Plan the Steering Group followed advice provided by BDC before the publication of the draft Local Plan. The housing requirement was then 10%. The Neighbourhood Plan is now almost ready for submission and on that basis stands a good chance of acceptance by residents. An increased requirement to 20% will not be accepted. Lound's NP must not be judged on the basis of the, yet to be agreed, Local Plan. It must be judged alongside all previously agreed plans. The vision for Small Rural Settlements (SRS)s is for small scale development to support local community objectives to meet local housing needs and sustain village services. Increasing the housing requirement to 20% will not deliver this vision. Lound residents are prepared to accept 10% (21 houses) - 20% would place too great a strain on existing infrastructure (drainage, power supply, broadband accessibility, roads and the very infrequent public transport. The original 20% cap has now evolved into a 20% requirement. BDC states that the target for houses for SRSs is 1090. A 20% target will provide 2124 houses. Some villages are already taking up the 20% target, so there seems little need for Lound to increase its target. Lound village has a public house and a village hall. It shares a church and a school with Sutton cum Lound. There is no shop and poor public transport (one two hourly bus to and from Retford except Sunday. A 20% housing requirement would mean an increase in the number of cars. there is already a huge parking problem. The Local Plan emphasises the | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| | | importance for smaller homes. these homeowners would be likely to need jobs and would be dependant on public transport. An increase in the housing requirement for small rural settlements is unacceptable. In Lound, the infrastructure would not support such and increase. Public transport is infrequent and therefore unusable so such an increase would result in an increase in private transport - against the stated objective of mitigating climate change. Drainage is already overloaded. Superfast broadband is available to only a few. | |
| 1193162 | Resident | There is no way that many of the smaller, rural villages can sustain a growth of 20% unless there is significant investment in the infrastructure supplying that area and in the Local Services that support the community. In Lound, the Superfast internet is already well under the 'guaranteed' speed that Ofcom specify and an additional 20% of housing will further slow this speed down to an unacceptable level for modern life. The roads to Lound cannot reasonably cope with the increase in traffic that 20% more properties will bring as the LGVs already driving through Lound are a large enough hazard. The proposals for new roads to be provided a very close distance from the main Mattersey to Sutton road will result in an unacceptable road hazard. It is also the case that the plan does not allow for the increase in population through extending existing properties which should be another way in which a rural village could increase its population. By allowing homeowners to create additional bedrooms and/or annexes will also allow for an increase in population and this should form part of any plan. Any increased growth should also be accompanied with a pro-rata increase in services such as GP and dental places, hospital beds, etc. Ill thought out and to impose a fixed increase of houses will lose character in rural communities. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF087 | Resident | Objection to the proposed 100% increase in the Housing Requirement of Small Rural Settlements, such as Lound. Been involved in producing a draft Neighbourhood Plan for Lound which met the conditions of the 2019 vBDC Local Plan, despite some local objections that it was too ambitious. Extensive surveys and consultations with parishioners, landowners and planning professionals, helped compile a draft NP which was realistic and deliverable. It was a compromise between strong local voices for no new building and providing our contribution to Bassetlaw's need for additional homes. Very careful consideration had been given to the infrastructure of Lound, which has severe limitations. No doubt several other SRSs face similar issues. Doubling the new build in Lound, and other SRSs, would be highly detrimental to the character and defining features of its built form and surroundings. An examination of the new Housing Requirement figures shown in Policy ST2, shows that an increase from 10% to 20% of SRSs would create an over-provision exceeding 1000 new dwellings, so it is as unnecessary as it is unsustainable. Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements "Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans" they will provide 20% growth. No such provision is afforded to SRSs, suggesting there is less importance to their Neighbourhood Plans. This should be rectified. SRSs should be targeted to provide 10% growth within the period of the BDC Local Plan, with those communities which have a desire to grow at a higher rate being encouraged to demonstrate their needs through Neighbourhood Plans. Frequent reviews are built into NPs to ensure they will fulfil their purpose. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF094 | Resident | The Lound steering group have worked extremely hard over the last 3 years, with the villagers to submit a Lound Neighbourhood Plan to Bassetlaw. After many long hours of consultation and meetings, it was decided that a minimum of 21 new houses should be considered. Am opposed to any further increase in new houses in the village. Lound is a very small rural settlement, with few amenities. There is already a long-standing problem with drainage issues and a sewage plant at capacity. Extra housing would create an even greater problem for existing residents. Find it astounding that BDC now have revised the number of new homes to 42! This will have a great impact on the character of our lovely small village. Understand the village steering group and Parish Councillors have rigorously protested with Bassetlaw officials, regarding this increase of new housing. Hopefully BDC will take notice of the village views and concerns. Hope you will revise your policy and accept the housing volume laid out in Lound's Neighbourhood Plan and not push forward with more unwanted housing in the village. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1194092 | Resident | Do not agree that Lound could sustain a doubling of a further 21 houses being built in this small rural community: Lack of frequent public transport does not support first time buyers/smaller starter homes. There are very few local jobs or industry, hence own transport would be essential. Poor road networks do not support any increase in traffic. Have been negotiating for many years to obtain speed restrictions in & out of the village, as yet without success. The infrastructure in Lound ie, current drainage, water & electricity supply would not support such a large increase. Parish Council has spent the last 4 years collecting evidence to produce its Draft Neighbourhood Plan with a general acceptance of a 10% increase & a doubling of this is not supportable at this time. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1194094 | Resident | See that it is proposed that each small Rural Settlement (the category into which Lound falls), has it's Housing Requirement doubled from 10% identified in 2018 to 20% in 2020. This increase is not required especially as Bassetlaw District Council's own figures predict a 3.7% population growth. The infrastructure in Lound would not support such a large increase. Drainage is already stretched, public transport limited, poor internet and mobile phone connection and there is no school or shop. I believe that a 20% increase in housing is not sustainable and should be reduced to 10% which would fulfil your area requirements. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF114 | Ranskill Parish Council | There appear to be discrepancies between figures stated in the Plan relating to Smaller Rural Settlements. Para 5.1.32 it states, "a minimum, combined, housing requirement of 1090 is proposed for the Small Rural Settlements". However, the 20% requirement stated in Policy ST2 will provide a total of 2,124 homes over 100% more. Please can this be clarified. The Parish Council are concerned that a blanket approach has been taken to housing allocation outside of the main towns. The Plan states that "Large Rural Settlements will be the main focus for development in rural areas". However, they are only required to take the same 20% growth as the Smaller Rural Settlements, regardless of the fact that these Larger Rural Settlements have far more in terms of infrastructure (a fact acknowledged in para 5.1.28 of the Plan). Smaller Rural Settlements, according to page 33 para 5.2.6, are only required to have "at least one of the following: a Primary School, Doctors Surgery, a community centre and a convenience store, a church or public house". A Smaller Rural Settlement with just a church and a village hall is being asked to support the same percentage increase in terms of dwellings as a Larger Rural Settlement and at the same time take a more than 50% cut to the CIL money provided by developers to improve infrastructure and facilities for residents. | The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan now includes a revised approach to Rural Bassetlaw by reducing the growth percentage for Small Rural Settlements to 5% |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF118 | Lound Parish Council | Lound Parish Council objects to an arbitrary uplift of 20% housing growth being applied to all Small Rural Settlements (SRS) as detailed within the Draft Local Plan policy ST2. Many areas lack the infrastructure to support such an increase, some are listed by Bassetlaw District Council as Areas of Conservation; as having Heritage assets or; as Areas of SSSI and, as such, special considerations should have been taken into account. Additionally, each small rural village should be individually assessed in detail and further diversity applied to the housing growth requirement to protect heritage assets, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Conservation areas, (or equivalent), areas of greenspace, greenbelt, Nature Reservations and the surrounding biodiversity. The current methodology of imposing an arbitrary increase demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and of local requirement. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF119 | WH Bett and Sons | As a resident of Darlton, it should have the opportunity of some new housing so that the village does not become stagnated. Share the same view for Ragnall. These very small, rural villages appeal to a lot of people and it would be good to given a few more people the chance to live in these villages. | Growth in rural Bassetlaw through Policy ST2 and through the development of Neighbourhood Plans. |
| REF120 | Residents | The residents of Lound, a Small Rural Settlement, came together and there was a general acceptance for 21 new properties to be built. An increase of 10% of Lound's present size, still maintaining it's Small Rural Settlement feel in which the residents of Lound choose to live. It has now been proposed that the 21 properties be increased to 42, this seems to be a vast increase of this Small Rural Settlement. The infrastructure in Lound is already under strain. Surface water and sewerage in particular cause flooding in and around various properties with in the village. Any further building would increase these problems, the present systems being somewhat out of date. This will only become worse with the present climate change situation, together with infrequent public transport, poor internet connection and other amenities, the village would not be conducive to small/starter homes. Lound put together a Neighbourhood Plan in which made Small Rural Settlements exempt from complying with the 20% growth of Large Rural Settlements. This makes a nonsense of all the hard work and consultations that people have put in, to protect this Small Rural Settlement. It appears to me that with all the proposed projects in and around Retford the Draft Plan ST 2 more than reaches its requirement and this Small Rural Settlement should be recognised as just that, and left with a 10% increase in housing and not 20% as is now being proposed. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1194599 | Residents | 20% regrowth for rural growth is to high and not what was agreed and approved by the NDP steering group. As a resident do not wish to see anymore new builds in our rural community. Bassetlaw have met their quota on new builds already. I move to this area to get away from the hussle and bussle of daily life not to be crammed back into another. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1194662 | Residents | Support up to of housing capped to 20% allocated to Rural areas | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |
| REF124 | Bolsover District Council | Bolsover District Council supports the aims of the draft Bassetlaw Local Plan to deliver sustainable development and meet the employment and housing needs arising in the district within the district. However, there are a number of areas where we would welcome further clarification/ discussions under the Duty to Co-operate as the Publication version of the Plan is developed. These are: Discussion of how the employment land requirement figure has been reached; How this has impacted on the proposed housing requirement; § How and where the proposed housing requirements for the small rural settlements of Cuckney, Holbeck, and Nether Langwith abutting or close to the boundary with Bolsover District are to be met. It is anticipated that the first two elements above would feed into a refresh of the Joint Housing Market Area (HMA) wide Statement of Common Ground (SoCG). | The matters raised will form part of future discussions relating to the Statement of Common Ground. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF133 | Consultant | Support Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 . This identifies the importance of the contribution that new rural housing can make to the broader sustainability of villages and that all rural settlements have a role to play in achieving this objective. The draft policy is consistent with Government Guidance as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework that supports sustainable development that will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In recognition of the well established planning principle that any new development should respect the identity and distinctiveness of the settlement it is important to relate the size, scale, form and character of new development to that of the settlement in which it is located. In order to identify settlements that could accommodate new housing whilst satisfying these requirements the Councils Spatial Strategy 2019 assessed all 103 settlements in Rural Bassetlaw. Settlements that could not satisfy the identified requirements either because they were too small or too dispersed were not identified as being able to accommodate any new housing development and will be classified as being in the countryside. Misterton is identified as a Large Rural Settlement that is capable of accommodating new housing development in accordance with the agreed principles. The specific site in question has been allocated in the past for residential development including the Bassetlaw Local Plan Consultative Draft 1993 in which it was designated as H77 and referred to as Old Forge Road with an area of 1.78Ha. In order to protect rural settlements from excessive development that would not be proportionate to the size and scale of existing settlements and as a result would be harmful to local identity and distinctiveness the Draft Local Plan proposes that the amount of new housing development should be limited to 20% of the existing number of dwellings. There will be the opportunity for local communities to increase the percentage of growth through the inclusion of 'exceptions housing' referred to in the policy. This provides flexibility to allow the local community to choose how they plan for growth, with options to determine the most appropriate location and type of housing in accordance with the overall spatial strategy. The emphasis is therefore clearly on the need to make provision for the future controlled growth of rural settlements. | All settlements will be subject to strict design policies either through the Local Plan or made Neighbourhood Plans for those areas. The Council is also producing a Design SPD to provide more detail on certain parts of the District. This will be closely linked to other SPDs and the Local Plan. |
| REF133 | Consultant | Misterton has a neighbourhood plan in which the particular site in question (see plan below) is not allocated for development. However the site falls clearly within the heart of the settlement and its development for residential development would be entirely consent with surrounding housing. Policy 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that there might be suitable development opportunities within the settlement boundary in addition to the specific allocations. Policy 5 states:- " Proposals for residential development within the development boundary will be supported subject to the following criteria: a) They would not cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of properties in the immediate locality; and b) They would be consistent with the character and appearance of the immediate locality; and c) They would provide suitable vehicular access. Proposals for residential development outside the development boundary will be supported where the accord with the principles included within Policy DM3 of the Bassetlaw District Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Management DPD." Section 5.2 and Policy ST2 of the draft Local Plan is therefore supported and recognises National Planning Policy that aims to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It is a positive policy that reflects a spatial growth strategy that should be commended. Furthermore the development of the site shown edged red in the plan below is consistent with the principles embodied within Policy 5, entitled Windfall Sites, of the Neighbourhood Plan. | Thank you for your comments. |
| REF136 | A and D Architecture | 3) Policy ST2 should be similarly modified and include new sub-section E as follows: "E The Council values the role the park home sector plays in the housing market offering an affordable alternative to mainstream housing for many people, often over the age of fifty, in mainly rural and semi-rural locations and will support applications for the development of new Park Home static caravan sites." | The Housing and Economic Development needs Assessment 2020 identifies no need for Park Home development. There is no need for this type of housing to be specifically referred to in Policy ST2. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1195111 | Resident | 20% is too greater number of properties. This equates to 70 dwellings, the infrastructure cannot cope. The impact to water levels. Carbon zero environment, how this be achieved, no bus service, no trains, no medical centre in the village, little in the way of shops. | The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a re-classification of settlements and the level of growth according to their size and service provision. |
| 1195161 | Resident | An available residential site at Gringley Road Misterton has been put forward since 2008. In the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan it was identified as NP03 Policy 9. This site should be added due to:- It was the democratic decision of the community, BDC supported "the development boundary will not be a consideration in the new local plan and Gringley Road has recently had permissions granted outside the said development boundary", The Minimum Housing Requirement is already out of date following planning approval on NP02 Policy 8 in the Misterton Neighbourhood Plan which had been identified as allocation for 12 dwellings but was approved for 4 dwellings showing a shortfall of 8 from the Housing Provision. ADD SITE TO ALLOCATION | Misterton is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size and level of services. The Local Plan is supportive of the recently adopted Misterton Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for development and the Local Plan does not seek to allocate any further sites within the village. |
| 1195187 | Resident | The plan is a blanket development of 20% that is not sustainable in some areas. The strategy is for a blanket increase in housing of 20% where some of the outlined communities cannot support this. As question 1, some communities can expand well beyond 20%, some cannot. | The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a re-classification of settlements and the level of growth according to their size and service provision. |
| 1195216 | Resident | 20% is too high and will drastically change the nature of these villages. Where is the evidence that these homes are needed? | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF149 | Resident | Object to an arbitrary uplift of 20% housing growth being applied to all Small Rural Settlements (SRS) as detailed within the Draft Local Plan policy ST2. The village of Lound falls into this category. This demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and of local requirement. Refers to The National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) section 15 details. Lound Village is a conservation area and therefore as a non-designated asset. It has a number of listed buildings; it has areas registered as designated sites of Special Scientific Interest and is surrounded by Nature Reserves. Yet all this has not been identified within Bassetlaw's Green Gap Report or within the New Settlement Study Methodology. The village cannot support a 20% housing growth uplift without serious impact on the aesthetics of the village, its wildlife or without the loss of Greenspace /Greenbelt, agricultural land or natural environment. Imposing such an increase will be disastrous. Our village has narrow streets which are not designed to take large traffic volume The water treatment plant is already at maximum capacity and lorries are driving to the plant numerous times a day to empty this facility already causing damage to the road, the hedges and subsequently wildlife on a daily basis In addition: Policy ST45 Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation has not been taken into consideration. Lound does not have a school, or shop and an infrequent bus service but does have green fields, woodlands and tranquility that sustain a variety of wildlife and fauna which you are wanting to destroy by building on green belt areas, which Teresa May, when in office, stated should be protected at all costs. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF150 | Resident | <p>It has been suggested previously that sites identified as part of the 2017 Land Availability Housing Assessment will be considered as part of this new plan process. This previously identified 5 sites in Clayworth, all of which were not considered further, as at that time, the previous Local Plan process did not identify the village as suitable for growth. It would appear unlikely that Clayworth would have suitable sites to accommodate even the minimum proposed housing requirement of 14 units, without contravening the Local Plan policies. Would expect that the Council seeks to apply its own proposed policies as part of the site allocation process i.e. now, rather than relying on them to protect settlements from unsuitable development post-allocation. Highways This is of relevance to Clayworth given it is served by only a single B road (B1403) which runs from Hayton through the village then up to Gringley on the Hill, alongside an unclassified road from Drakeholes through the village to Wheatley. The addition of 14 to 28 new dwellings would add significant pressure on the road network, within and surrounding Clayworth, which it is entirely unable to accommodate. This should be considered as part of the housing numbers allocation process.</p> | <p>Clayworth is considered a small rural settlement due to its size and level of services. This enables a small level of growth in the village over the plan period subject to it meeting other relevant policies in the Local Plan. But the Local Plan does not allocate sites in the Small Rural Settlements. Their growth is more appropriately managed through Neighbourhood Plans or through appropriate planning applications. Clayworth could also look to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to manage this development in a way that is acceptable to the community.</p> |
| REF159 | Lound Parish Council | <p>Have been using the Requirement of a 10% increase in our housing stock. During our consultations with the members of the village we found that the majority thought that little or no development was desirable and thus have produced a plan that meets with that response but which also allows for development to meet the Requirement. Now, find that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS) will have a Requirement of 20%, a 100% increase of the previous Draft Plan. This will go against the desires of the village and will negate over 4 years' work, wasting Local and Central Government Public funds, and innumerable hours of volunteers' time. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan to be provided by SRS is 1090, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. The current methodology of imposing an arbitrary increase demonstrates a clear lack of understanding of the area, of rural life and local needs. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is rudimentary, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, notably ST45 1a and 1c, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. Lound Village is listed as a conservation area and therefore as a non-designated asset. It has a number of listed buildings; it has areas registered as designated sites of Special Scientific Interest and is surrounded by Nature Reserves. Yet none of this has been identified within Bassetlaw's Green Gap Report or within the New Settlement Study Methodology. The village cannot support a 20% housing growth uplift without serious impact on the aesthetics of the village and its wildlife or without the loss of Greenspace/Greenbelt, agricultural land or natural environment. Imposing such an increase will be disastrous. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Your Draft Plan Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...they will provide 20% growth'. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this obviously diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Where these plans have been assessed and approved by the local authority and are supported by the local community through a referendum, they should be given the same importance as Neighbourhood Plans for Large Rural Settlements, and their influence should be reinforced in the process of the determining of planning outcomes. The requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs should be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p> | <p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1195333 | Resident | The 20% increase in housing is too large. When the Neighbourhood Plan was first mooted it was considered that in rural villages there would be a 10% increase in housing. This, in itself, led to some resistance from the residents in Lound but after some public meetings it was agreed that there should be approval for 21 houses, ie 10%. However, the latest draft local plan now states that 20% more housing should be provided. Double what was originally suggested and which I think will put unnecessary stress on the infrastructure and change the nature of rural villages | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1195356 | Resident | These areas are rural for a reason. People buy homes here to be rural not be linked to the next village or town. If they wanted to live in a town or village they would buy homes there . Made rural.... leave it rural | the majority of growth has been directed to the larger settlements and settlements in the rural areas. The majority of the countryside is being protected. |
| 1195365 | Resident | Building 20% worth of extra houses on Lound would not be realistic and would damage the village in terms of its character. Also the infrastructure only just about supports the residents now. We moved to the village because it was quiet and rural and would hate to see this destroyed. If this happened we would most likely have no choice but to move and find somewhere else akin to Lound as.The bassetlaw District council own figures demonstrate that this number is not required? | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF175 | Resident | Raise concerns regarding the Housing Requirement being imposed on Lound in the draft Local Plan. The village of Lound is a rural community with limited infrastructure. The increased Housing Requirement figure of 20% is far too large and will be severely detrimental to the rural nature of the village. Lound's Neighbourhood Plan has identified support for reasonable growth of 21 homes. This figure represents significant growth for such a small village however the proposal to double this through the introduction of a 20% increase is ridiculous. Understand that the 20% requirement will actually provide more than the 1090 new homes that you wish to generate from the Small Rural Settlement category and that you already believe that some villages will perform at 20% anyway. There is no need to enforce additional housing requirements on other settlements, especially when this risks undermining an emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The Housing Requirement figure must be reduced back to 10%. This will meet your own requirements and allow the Lound Neighbourhood Plan to continue to be supported in its delivery of positive housing growth in the village. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1195879 | Hamlin Estates TwelveTwentyOne Planning Services | The 20% cap for identified Small Rural Settlements is counter-intuitive and contradictory to the requirement for these to provide a 'minimum' of 1090 dwellings. This 'cap' should be either removed or it should be made clear that the 20% targets are 'around the minimum level of housing delivery required'. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1195884 | Resident | Disagree with good agricultural land being taken out of use for housing. The brownfield sites should be developed first and scrubland not used for agriculture. Also further development at Oldcotes and Styrrup is not really feasible as any development at Oldcotes, firstly would be outside the parameters of the village and the nearest amenities being at Langold or Harworth and at Styrrup would be like a separate settlement. There is no employment as such in either place. | The Local plan has allocated a number of brownfield sites and encourages the redevelopment of these over the plan period but there is not enough to meet available sites to meet identified needs. So some greenfield land is required. Styrrup and Oldcotes are considered separate settlements in Policy ST2. In addition, the Langold Neighbourhood Plan identifies a "green gap" between itself and Oldcotes to help maintain the level of separation. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1195911 | Aspbury Planning Limited | Support the principle of organic growth up to 20% in the Small Rural Settlements, concern lie with ensuring that delivery of the housing actually occurs within these settlements since policy ST1 indicates that the minimum provision of 1090 dwellings will only come forward on nonallocated sites or sites to be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans. Figure 7 sets out options for delivery ranging from complete organic growth (no allocations) through to all growth delivered by Neighbourhood Plans. At what point will the respective Neighbourhood Plan groups have to commit to either of the 5 options set out in Figure 7 so that landowners can respond accordingly with submissions to an NP review or planning applications to BDC. Unless clarity and timescales are set out there is huge potential for confusion, delay and conflict and for anti-development communities to potentially stall logical development opportunities. Clarification needs to be given confirming what the base number of dwellings as at August 2018 actually comprises in terms of unimplemented dwelling commitments (outline and full) granted prior to August 2018 and whether they form part of the base supply or part of the 20% growth allowance. This clarification of a cut -off point between current base dwelling supply and future growth is critical if this policy is to be considered effective and positively prepared in the tests for soundness. | The housing numbers and distribution has been revised in the latest version of the Local Plan in response to comments through the previous consultation period and the latest evidence base. Those numbers still include growth in our rural communities and the allocation of sites within the larger settlements across the District. See revised Policy ST1. The rural monitoring framework has been revised to provide more clarity for users on the points identified. |
| REF183 | Resident | For Clayworth have concerns with the Council's rationale for taking a 20% blanket housing growth allocation across smaller settlements, which does not take into account their relative status i.e. whether they are Conservation Areas or not. Have concerns that this allocation does not take into account the ability of each settlement to practically accommodate this number of new dwellings due to the lack of specific housing site allocations for these smaller settlements (outside of Neighbourhood Plans). This leaves these smaller settlements open to the potential for speculative development by land owners who wish to press a case against the other policies within the plan. Whilst it could be said that the policies aimed at protecting the character and form of Conservation Areas could be used as a form of protection against unwanted development, the simply fact that the Council has declared that villages such as Clayworth could accommodate these means that there is a risk that in the push to achieve the housing targets, developers will seek to work around rather than with policies aimed at protecting this status. | Clayworth is considered a small rural settlement due to its size and level of services. This enables a small level of growth in the village over the plan period subject to it meeting other relevant policies in the Local Plan. Clayworth could also look to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to manage this development in a way that is acceptable to the community. |
| 1195921 | Resident | Building 20% worth of extra houses on Lound would not be realistic and would damage the village in terms of of its character. Also the infrastructure only just about supports the residents now. We moved to the village because it was quiet and rural and would hate to see this destroyed. If this happened we would most likely have no choice but to move and find somewhere else akin to Lound .The bassetlaw District council own figures demonstrate that this number is not required? | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF194 | Clarborough and Welham Parish Council | Further concern is the way that the Local Plan sees the allocation of sites which were granted planning consent before the August 2018 deadline. Many of these sites have not been built, therefore, no houses. If the Plan is genuinely looking for extra builds then these, surely should count towards any allocation. A further problem, that of 'legal starts' also denies the part which previous consents can count towards required numbers. Have one such site which has 'legal start' applied to it. This was granted Consent around 2005 and was started. These houses are not being built, why is the planning permission not rescinded and perhaps the land opened for new proposals to be brought forward. The site in question is both unbuilt and a blight on the Parish with overgrown hedges and land. | The Local Plan allows for developments since 1st April 2018 to be counted towards the rural housing requirement. 2018 is the base date for the plan period and is also largely when Neighbourhood plans have been proposing sites since. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF194 | Clarborough and Welham Parish Council | Want to ensure all housing development and business development is consistent with the vision and policies set out in the Clarborough & Welham Neighbourhood Plan. Want to ensure all development retains the character of our Parish and the two separate villages. It is not convinced that some of the proposals of the 'Draft' Strategic Plan allows this to take place in a way which is beneficial to our Parish. | The Local Plan supports developments that are of high-quality design. Further detail on design will be produced through a Supplementary Planning Document |
| 1196000 | Resident | Whilst the intended cap of 20% housing increase seems sensible in principle, there is no obvious consideration that this may be appropriate for some villages, but not others. It may be that the available suitable land in one village, for example, would warrant a higher proportion of housing increase than in others. On the face of it, the 20% increase therefore seems arbitrary, and takes no account of the specific requirements/capacity of the various communities. This links into a further concern about the increases in housing. For some villages the increases may mean that it might be appropriate to provide additional services and resources - e.g. shops, transport infrastructure, healthcare. A more cynical view taken of the 20% cap might be that this means the allocation of additional services will be less of a requirement, even though the spread of housing may be better served by having greater numbers in certain locations over others. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1196060 | Resident | only support in line with neighbourhood plan of 20% increase for each community not a disproportionately large housing project as proposed in ST5 | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |
| REF198 | Consultant | Para 5.1.32 This proposes a 20% cap per parish as though it were a "one size fits all" policy. It is not. Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe have engaged, researched and produced a document embracing and promoting residential development. They have done the legwork and found that to maintain the villages' viability, including its existing services and with a hope to advance service provision, a constant number of families need to be consistently attracted to the village. This is something that appears lacking with this 20% cap justification and most certainly is lacking in many Neighbourhood Plans where control is the main theme. | Mattersey and Mattersey Thorpe have produced a Neighbourhood Plan and have appropriately planned for growth as identified in the previous version of the Local Plan. The NP can be reviewed in time if the community wishes to do so. |
| REF199 | Stancliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake | Have concerns however regarding the proposed Spatial Strategy, particularly in respect to Rural Villages. Support the objectives of sustainable development and recognise that a balanced approach to growth should be adopted in order to achieve this, the approach taken to large and small rural settlements is not fully evidenced; this undermines the soundness of the Plan. | The spatial strategy has been reviewed in the latest version of the Local Plan. This has also updated the proposed settlement hierarchy and the distribution of growth. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF199 | Stancliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake | Large Rural Settlements are in the same category as Main Towns and there is provision for allocations in these categories of settlement, which we concur with. The policy also allows for appropriate forms of development within their settlement boundaries. It is considered that in order to allow for greater flexibility provision should be made for sustainable development adjacent to settlement boundaries where there is clear evidence that the Council do not have a 5 year supply of housing land or they are failing to deliver the required amount of housing per annum. The table included with Policy ST1 also defines which settlements fall into each category. The background paper on the revised spatial strategy stated that: ' The role of each level of the strategy reflects population size, their location in respect of other settlements and the range of services present and their ability to expand to accommodate the needs generated by new development'. Policy ST2 sets out the number of dwellings in each settlement rather than the population size and in the evidence base there would not appear to be any analysis of the population size of the rural settlement has been undertaken. In the most recent 2018 population estimates, Blyth has a population of 1,214 (a reduction in population since the 2011 Census) and Shireoaks has a population of 1,394 representing an increase. Shireoaks has been identified as a 'Small Rural Village' whereas Blyth is categorised as a 'Large Rural Settlement', despite the fact that Shireoaks supports a larger number of dwellings. Although Shireoaks does not have a medical centre it supports all of the other facilities listed at paragraph 5.2.5 of the draft Local Plan. It also benefits from a railway station with good connectivity to Lincoln, Worksop and Sheffield. In addition, there is an industrial estate within the settlement that supports a number of businesses, thereby providing employment opportunities for residents of Shireoaks and the wider area. | The level of growth per settlement is based on the number of dwellings as of 1st August 2018 and the number of services and facilities. The revised Local Plan has provided an update to policies ST1 and ST2 and the justification reflects those changes. Large Rural Settlements are not in the same category as Main Towns. Main Towns are in the top tier of the hierarchy so are expected to take more growth proportionate to their position in the hierarchy and sustainability credentials. |
| REF199 | Stancliffe Homes Ltd Cushwake | Draft Policy ST2 should be reworded. B. Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans or through a masterplan framework agreed with the Council, residential development in Large Rural Settlements within the Parishes identified below or in the case of Cottam within the redline boundary identified on the Policies Map, will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1764 new dwellings of the District's housing requirementThe scale and density of development proposed should be appropriate to the character, shape and built form of that part of the settlement and should not normally exceed 1 hectare in size should conform to the principles of sustainable development Small Rural Settlements C. Residential development in Small Rural Settlements within the Parishes listed below, will collectively accommodate a minimum of 1090 dwellings of the District's housing requirement Parish Base number of dwellings, August 2018 20% housing increase in Dwellings to 2037 Shireoaks 645 129 Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plan or Part E of this policy applies, additional development in Small Rural Settlements over the plan period will be supported provided that all of the criteria below are satisfactorily met, and the proposal is consistent with other policies in this Plan: 3. A single proposal should not exceed 10 dwellings, unless it can be demonstrated that it will provide a community benefit, including affordable housing or open space provision As drafted Policy ST2 is not positively prepared and is unsound as it lacks flexibility to deliver the long-term strategic growth of the District. | The level of growth per settlement is based on the number of dwellings as of 1st August 2018, its population and the number of services and facilities. The revised Local Plan has provided an update to policies ST1 and ST2 and the justification reflects those changes. |
| 1196242 | Resident | As a rural district, should be looking to protect and keep as many of our rural communities and small towns/villages as they are. Nature is great for people wellbeing and we need to make sure we protect that. | Thank you for your comment. |
| REF206 | Resident | Ragnall The proposed plans will effect our village mainly the volume of traffic ,at the moment it is terrible heavy vehicles day and night ,the road has been surfaced but it will need doing again.The crossroads is an accident waiting to happen they are dangerous and traffic going down into and out of Dunham do not exceed the speed limit it needs reducing .My son was killed on that road 3 xmas ago how many more families have to go through the pain of losing a loved one.I wrote to the highways about my concerns but they did not even reply to my letter ,we are a forgot on village something needs to be done . | In terms of the growth of sites in the area. Highways safety is an important part of traffic management for new development. Further traffic assessment has been undertaken on those roads to look at capacity and also highway safety. The work also looked at what mitigation is needed. This work will be developed further through the master planning and planning application process for sites so that it includes the most up to date information about a sites proposed uses, the level of growth and its proposed access points etc... |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF214 | Oxalis Planning | Disagree with the 20% cap on growth proposed at paragraph 5.2.8 in the supporting text for Policy ST2, which is formalised within the Policy itself. The proposed 20% cap for the number of dwellings to be delivered in the Large Rural Settlements will be restrictive in the long term. The cap may become an issue if anticipated delivery elsewhere slips behind schedule requiring the Council to look towards the Large Rural Settlements for additional housing growth. In this context, the concept of an arbitrary cap appears unnecessarily restrictive and it should be revised or removed to ensure that the Plan is supportive of sustainable growth. 20% could be used as a guiding figure, but it should not be used as an inflexible cap on development. The Plan period covers 17 years and therefore the Plan needs to include the capacity to respond to any possible changes and challenges which the District may face over the entire lifetime of the Plan. | The majority of growth in the large rural settlements has now been accommodated either through planning permissions or through the allocation of sites through Neighbourhood Plans. The 20% or 5% threshold is a significant level and this growth is supported by existing infrastructure and is therefore seen as deliverable. It is noted that additional development above the % requirement may be supported if there is need for additional growth or through the review or development of a Neighbourhood Plan and there is community support. |
| REF215 | Trustees of H S Wallis | There is a clear need to resolve the disparity between ST1 and ST2 and surely that must be in the favour of ST1 as far as housing is concerned if the "Strategic Objectives" set out at Section 4.2 are to be achieved. Draft Policy ST2 as it stands sets out the approach to distributing the numbers of dwellings needed in LRS's up to 2037. The number for Blyth is 111 using (correctly?) a rate of increase of 20% from base number of 553 and base date of August 2018. Since the Draft Local Plan does not appear to be making any housing allocations in "North Blyth and IF the Draft Blyth Neighbourhood Plan is correct in policy terms in seeking to apply the 20% limit, this appears to result in no more than a further 8 dwellings to be permitted for the remaining plan period i.e. a further 17 years !!! At 2 dwellings per year for the next 17 years that will not help to deliver the step change sought by the Local Plan nor provide the sort of choice in the housing market that Policy ST1 and National Policy seek. However, Policy ST2 seems to recognise that there will be other housing development in these settlements and indicates that they will be on sites not normally larger than 1 hectare so long as they meet "...local housing needs..." Interestingly because of its shape and other limitations the subject site in "North Blyth" has a net developable area of around 1 hectare. | Policy ST1 and ST2 have now been revised following the feedback from public consultation. The revision hopefully provides a clearer link between the policies. |
| REF217 | Resident | Concerned about the approach taken to the allocation of houses for Smaller Rural Settlements and the fact that these SRS of which Lound is one, are required to take the same increase in housing as the Larger Rural Settlements (20%) regardless of the fact that they have far fewer amenities and facilities, a fact which you yourselves acknowledge in the Plan. In the latest version of the plan Lound has had its housing requirement doubled from 10% to 20%. This is too many in a village where the only amenities are a small village hall and a pub. There is also a discrepancy in the figures given in the Plan regarding SRS - on page 27 it states that a minimum housing requirements of 1090 is proposed for SRS and then in policy ST2 the figures provided give a total of 2,124 - a 100% over-provision. So why is there a need for Lound to have its requirement doubled? The requirement for a 20% increase should be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if a Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local need. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF222 | Notts CC | Minerals and Waste Part D, 6 of the policy states that any non-mineral development proposal in a Mineral Safeguarding Areas will need to meet the requirements set out in the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. This is in line with the Publication Version of the Minerals Local Plan and is welcomed by the County Council. | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1196532 | East Markham Parish Council | At the last census, (2011) East Markham had 490 dwellings, this had increased to 524 by August 2018 representing a rise in Housing stock of 5.7%. In contrast, Clarbrough and Welham (also defined as a small rural settlement within the plan) has since an increase in dwellings from 480 in the census to 495 by August 2018. This represents an increase of 3.1% in their housing stock. Since April 2018 East Markham has seen applications for a further 35 residential properties reflecting the rapid change in our village with little thought to overall design and planning. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen congestion on the village's roads with little apparent thought given to the infrastructure of the village. East Markham PC requests that BDC view each application in the wider context of development in the village rather than on an individual basis. At the time of writing there are 59 houses either being developed or approved around Mark Lane / Beckland Hill. Little apparent thought appears to have been given to the impact that these 3 separate developments will have on roads and drainage in this area. East Markham PC has concerns about the ability of the Council to adhere to the notional 20% cap within the lifespan of the plan. East Markham parish council believes that recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration. | The Local Plan has considered existing commitments for each settlement from 1st April 2018. This takes into account some existing planning permissions and completions. This will be monitored through the Council's Rural Monitoring Framework. In addition, the impact of new development on local character is important and the design policy in the Local Plan will be supported by a more detailed "design supplementary planning document". However, if the PC would like to undertake more localised work on its local character, then a review of the made Neighbourhood Plan could support this through the production of a character assessment for East Markham. |
| 1196544 | Resident | Disagree with ST2. Many other aspects of the plan are really good. | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |
| 1196544 | Resident | Strong objection to your plans which could see the building of over 40 new dwellings in Lound. My main reason is that there is no infrastructure to support new dwellings. We have a very infrequent bus route. We have no schools or nurseries, no doctors surgery, no dentist, and no shops. The people who live in Lound rely on driving a car. If a family move in, and one partner is working, the other partner will also need a car in order to get around. Thus you will be increasing the number of cars needed on the road, and pollution. Compare this to building homes in areas where there are already facilities and good eco friendly transport links. My husband and I have shared a car for decades. On moving to Lound in 2019, we found we needed to purchase another car, so that we could go about our normal lives. I know of one mature lady, not a driver, who used to live in Retford, and access many activities and the shops. She regrets moving to Lound as she now finds it very difficult to access her activities, causing a sense of isolation. Your policy seems like a very general one size fits all plan which is actually not a plan. It is not thought through, there is no logic to it. It does not consider the impact on the environment and the need for infrastructure which will enable people to live well. There must be many areas with necessary facilities and links which could easily have room for new homes, where people could join communities and lead fulfilled lives. Unless you intend to build more facilities and substantially improve transport links, Lound is not such a place. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| 1196559 | Resident | Regards to the Housing Quantities there appear to be discrepancies at Bothamsall. The document lists 114 dwellings. However, within the PARISH there are 105 that I am aware of, with only 75 being within the settlement. Not been able to get a concrete answer as to where the 20% extra are to be located. In the first consultation I was advise that the extra housing was to be within the 'settlement', i.e. in the VILLAGE of Bothamsall, not the Parish. If this is the case then the 20% should be of the 75 dwellings within the settlement, not the number in the Parish. If the location of the housing is to be withing the PARISH, then the 20% should be of the 105 (not 114 as listed in the Document). | Noted. The number of dwellings for Bothamsall and the parish have been checked with our Council Tax department and updated. There are 102 properties in the parish and only 74 within the village of Bothamsall and therefore it has been removed from the list of Small Rural Settlements. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1196642 | Resident | The 20% cap on rural developments does not make sense. It is far too permissive. The caveat (pg 25) "Whilst Large Rural Settlements will be the main focus for development in rural areas, proportionate growth to a maximum of 20% per Parish settlement - as identified by the previous two draft Plans 5,7- will be supported where it will not have an adverse effect on the character or amenity of the settlement." No confidence this will be adequately monitored and when unsupported development to this extent has taken place, it will be too late. Strongly support a lower cap, say 10% and exceptions to be made where it is clearly demonstrated that there are sufficient local amenities including transport to properly support and maintain such growth. Most of the rural communities have inadequate resources, particularly for young growing families, support the main thrust of the policy to develop amenities and housing in areas where they will clearly deliver quality living and good value for money. Some rural communities should expand by up to, and in some cases, more than 20% but these need to be carefully selected for their potential to have the wider investments needed. | Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework which is updated monthly to provide a robust basis for monitoring the policy and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans. |
| 1196674 | Resident | Live in Ranby Village and am opposed to any further housing development within the village due to the infrastructure i.e. roads, drainage, walkways etc, in my opinion is unsuitable for any further development. Have inadequate drainage for the amount of houses currently and frequently have flooded roads and blocked drainage, Footpaths are narrow and some places nonexistent and poorly maintained with inadequate street lighting. It is my belief that any further development in the Ranby Village would put extra strain on the already weak infrastructure that is currently in place. Any further development would also increase air pollution due to extra traffic in the area along with disturbing wildlife and the natural beauty of the village. | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |
| REF239 | Consultant | Oppose the proposal to build 51 dwellings in the village as we do not believe that it is fair to allocate the whole parish's commitment to the building plan to one village alone. Ranby has only 89 dwellings currently and therefore an increase of a further 51 would mean a 57% increase. • The village has very few facilities which do not require, or would benefit from, a further increase in population • The village dwellings are predominately heated by means of oil, a fossil fuel, and any additional houses are likely to be on the same • There are already parking issues around the school which is situated on one of only two 'main' roads in Ranby. • There are no employment opportunities in Ranby and therefore any new residents will be commuters to Worksop, Retford or much further afield impacting on noise, air pollution and generating a greater carbon footprint for the area. • The village already has two areas which regularly flood. Further buildings and hard surface areas will only increase the flooding and impact the local residents • The village has only limited broadband and further users would again impact on the current local residents. The potential solution would be to allocate the whole of the parish's allocation to the proposed Garden Village east of A1/A57. The Garden Village is expected to be for 4000 dwellings and all the infrastructure to support that population will be provided at the same time with employment being potentially provided by the industrial estate to be built nearby. The environmental issues could be planned for making all of the dwellings carbon neutral, provide electric car charging points and proper drainage to deal with climate change. | The housing requirement for the Small Rural Settlements has been updated following consultation. In addition, the spatial strategy and District housing distribution has also changed. See ST1. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1196688 | Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council | <p>As part of the revision of Sturton Ward’s Neighbourhood Plan, in 2018, asked local residents for site submissions from across the whole ward, including the village of Bole. Only one site – NP27 – was put forward near Bole, and this site was rejected as part of the “initial sift” for the following reasons: BDC Planning Policy commented “Separate from the built form of the village”; NCC Highways commented “This site is not considered to be a suitable location. The Highway Authority would only consider replacement of the existing use with limited residential”. On this basis, we would like the target for Bole – 12 properties – to be reduced and/or removed entirely because we do not believe that there are any suitable sites for this number of houses in the village. ** As part of the revision of Sturton Ward’s Neighbourhood Plan, in 2018, we asked for site submissions from across the whole ward. Over 40 sites were submitted in total, and we have subsequently analysed the potential of each site – with partners such as AECOM – to meet the target 10% increase in housing requested by Bassetlaw, subsequently increased to 20% in January 2020. The numbers currently appear as follows: *NORTH LEVERTON* New housing target (January 2020) - 93 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 46 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 46 Delta - 1 *STURTON LE STEEPLE* New housing target (January 2020) - 43 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 7 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 15 Delta - 21 *NORTH AND SOUTH WHEATLEY* New housing target (January 2020) - 53 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 14 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 24 Delta - 15 *BOLE* New housing target (January 2020) - 12 Permissions granted since April 2018 (based on BDC figures shared by Will Wilson on 19/02/20) - 0 New housing identified for suitable sites put forward as part of the Neighbourhood Plan process (February 2020) - 0 Delta - 12 This means the ward is currently only able to deliver 76% of the target 20% increase in housing requested by Bassetlaw in January 2020. We would, therefore like to reduce our target increase from 20% to 15%. There are a five main reasons for this. Firstly, we have reviewed each site put forward carefully, and believe that the remaining sites are not suitable for housing. Secondly, there are genuine concerns about flooding in the ward, given houses in Sturton and Wheatley were flooded in November 2019, as was Wheatley School. All three villages were flooded in 2007. There isn’t currently a drainage board in place to maintain water channels to the west of key settlements, meaning the risk of flooding would further increase as a result of excessive development in North Leverton, Wheatley and Sturton. Thirdly, there is a lot of development already / potentially taking place in the ward (Tarmac quarry near Sturton, closure of West Burton A power station, potential construction of West Burton C power station, closure of nearby Cottam power station, potential construction of a 233-acre solar farm). A 15% increase in housing, on top of all this activity, feels more than sufficient given the likely increase in traffic volumes associated with these developments, and the impact that this will have on resident lifestyles. Fourthly, several sizeable planning permissions were approved across Sturton Ward in the 24-month period BEFORE April 2018 (Bassetlaw’s cut-off date for housing contributions to the Local Plan period). These houses won’t contribute to our 2037 targets BUT are being constructed right now. This means that the ward is delivering new housing supply TODAY which isn’t being accounted for in the above numbers. If these houses were included, we expect that we would be close to the 20% figure anyway. Finally, there are concerns about the safety of North Leverton crossroads which is used by hundreds of ward residents on a daily basis. Over 1,000 residents have recently signed a petition calling for Nottinghamshire County Council to review safety measures at this junction. We simply don’t believe that the ward can absorb 201 houses (and, with it, potentially c.400 cars) without FIRST making this extremely dangerous crossroads safer. Irrespective of how many houses are built in the ward, we would like the updated Local Plan to consider proper investment to address this structural deficiency, and recommend making this a prerequisite for any further development in Sturton Ward.</p> | <p>All housing commitments and completions are monitored through the Council's Rural Monitoring Framework, updated monthly and this has influenced the revision to the policy. The Local Plan sets the overall framework for directing growth across the District - it's policies are high-level. The level of anticipated growth in these settlements has now been revised to 10% following comments made to policy ST02 during the previous consultation. This will hopefully be inline with the review of the Neighbourhood Plan and support its ongoing work.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1196689 | Resident | The parish of Babworth is a large rural parish with about 250 homes. It is unrealistic to arbitrarily add 20% and expect all 20% (Or 50) to be added to Ranby village that has less than 100 houses. . | Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans. |
| REF247 | Babworth Parish Council | Applaud the vision of an ambitious, innovative and positive planning framework for addressing the District's housing and economic needs and other social and environmental priorities by 2037. Concerns reagrding the implementation of the Local Plan and am seeking clarification on a few of the finer points with the Parish of Babworth. With regard to the small rural developments, Ranby has been assigned 51 new homes, based on 255 existing dwellings. There are two errors herein: 1. Ranby is not a Parish, according to the Bassetlaw website: " Babworth is a village and civil parish... In addition to the village of Babworth the parish also includes Ranby". Assume that the document will be corrected so that Babworth is included in the Plan? 2. There are - 100 dwellings in Ranby. How the figure of 255 dwellings was calculated? Have the authors calculated all the dwellings in the Babworth Parish (including Ranby) and assigned this total to the village? If this is the case, the Bassetlaw Local Plan is in breach of its own policy of "proportionate growth to a maximum of 20% per Parish settlements". Assigning the full 20% of dwellings to Ranby is not proportionate. | Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019. |
| REF249 | Pegasus Group | Langold is considered to be a sustainable settlement suitable for future residential development. The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (January 2020) at Table A.3.1 identifies Langold as functionally linked with the settlement of Carlton in Lindrick. It is recognised that these settlements have a good range of services, facilities and employment opportunities. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The identification of Langold as Large Rural Village is therefore supported and considered appropriate. It is considered that the housing figures provided within the consultation document should not be seen as a cap for development, instead it is important that the Council identify opportunity sites such as our clients as discussed in Section 6. | Planning permissions in Langold more than meet the proposed 20% level og growth in the settlement and therefore any additional development would need to be justified. The emerging Langold Neighbourhood Plan has included a policy to support infilling within the proposed development boundary of the settlement. |
| REF259 | South Leverton Parish Council | The proposed cap for new build housing of 20% of existing houses in the designated parish area. At recent neighbourhood plan meetings with BDC representatives we were given a new build directive to include for a minimum of 10% of existing houses in the designated parish area with a cap of 20% of existing houses in the village area. We interpret this new single criterion as BDC proposing to double the minimum option for new builds to be included in neighbourhood plans. Village Existing Parish New builds Dwellings (20%) Dunham 184 37 East Drayton 105 21 Treswell with Cottam 99 20 South Leverton 212 42 North Leverton 465 93 Sturton le Steeple 213 43 Sub-total 1278 Add in; - Cottam station site 0 450 Total 1278 706 Ratio of new builds to existing dwellings is 55.2%. This is a gross violation of the BDC declared cap of 20%. In addition, it is argued that account should also be taken of the 90 log cabins accommodation BDC have granted planning for on the Sundown site. This will increase the adverse impact on increased road traffic through these villages. Hence there is a potential for 796 new builds. The increased number of new builds ratio to existing houses then becomes 62.3%. Bearing in mind that each new build family would drive between one and three vehicles, it is reasonable to suggest there would be an increase of some 1500 additional domestic vehicles travelling through these villages. What action could be taken to resolve this issue? BDC could lobby national government to provide funds and authority to construct suitable new roads which would provide bypass routes around these villages. The realism of such a consideration is questionable, and at least very long term before any conclusions would be announced. The immediate pragmatic solution would be for BDC to abandon their proposal to develop the Cottam power station site for housing. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. This include the percentage growth requirement and the list of settlements that classify. See Policies ST1 and ST2. Log cabins are visitor accommodation so cannot be counted in the housing growth. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF262 | West Stockwith Parish Council | For clarity, there is some confusion about the numbers of houses within West Stockwith listed in the "Base Number of Dwellings" at the survey date. Can you confirm whether these numbers include North Carr Road and Heckdyke, or have they been included elsewhere? Additionally, since West Stockwith was not included in the original site allocations exercise, can you confirm if any land has been identified as possible housing sites for the council to consider? | The number of dwellings includes all dwellings within West Stockwith parish boundary on 1st August 2018. |
| 1196914 | Resident | why does new housing need to be built on good grade 3 agricultural land. why build in green belt taking good grade 3 agricultural land out of food production | The Council prioritises the redevelopment of brownfield land and includes available suitable sites in the Local Plan. But there are not enough areas of brownfield land in sustainable locations to meet identified housing needs, so the Local Plan has to look at the release of greenfield land for future development. |
| REF275 | Consultant | Appreciate the importance for growth in rural locations and villages, cannot understand the reasoning for the plan to exceed the requirements of villages and rural areas with no clear evidence base for the actual needs. This evidence base is fundamental in the future planning and strategy ensuring the future prosperity of the district. It is for the above reason that we oppose the approach taken in ST2. It is not clear how the local plan has arrived at these apportionments or indeed the method of selecting the appropriate sites. It is appreciated that the hierarchy may not need to religiously adhere to, having some evidence is imperative. This plan fails to demonstrate this. | The Local Plan has taken the approach to support some growth in rural communities - especially those where there has been very limited development and there is now a need for some additional growth. 80% of Bassetlaw is considered rural and settlements have lost a number of local services and facilities and there has been an undersupply of affordable or low cost housing in these areas. In addition, a number of communities in the District have produced a Neighbourhood Plan to support and encourage new development with the aim to support local housing need and local services and facilities. |
| REF276 | Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council | Small Rural Settlements (SRS) are required to accommodate a minimum of 1,090 dwellings of the Districts housing requirement. This requirement is mentioned in Policy ST1 and detailed in Policy ST2. Policy ST2 shows the 20% housing increase applied to the base number of dwellings (those that paid council tax as of August 2018). The sum of the uplift of 20% across the parishes totals 2,124 dwellings rather more than the required 1,090 dwellings hence some scope for paring the overall requirement back to around 10%. The imposition of a broad brush uplift across the SRS's and indeed the large Rural Settlements is arguably the poor mans approach to allocating against housing needs. What is required is a housing needs assessment based on a an assessment of the actual requirements and characteristics of a Parish taking into consideration the individual circumstances, the existing infrastructure, schools, shops (none in Sutton Ward) and impact on areas of natural beauty and historical interest. Failing a more rigorous and realistic approach to assessing housing needs an across the board uplift of around 10% does seem to fit the bill of those parishes that have existing or emerging Neighbourhood Plans. | The spatial strategy and housing distribution for the District has been reviewed and changed in the most recent Local Plan. See updated Policy ST1 and ST2. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF277 | Babworth Parish Council | The Council's wider approach to planning for the rural area is also flawed. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural area and its settlements is to establish the development needs of those villages and apportion an appropriate level of development where those needs arise. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has not been evidenced based and does not reflect the levels of growth which are actually required to support the rural area. Such an evidenced based approach is vital to understanding, and planning for, the future health of rural settlements. With specific regard to Babworth, the Parish is a large rural parish comprising predominantly a farming based community. The parish has circa 250 homes within the parish boundary and the largest settlement is Ranby. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan subsequently seeks to allocate 51 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 20% uplift to the settlement's size, this is factually incorrect, as Ranby Village has c.78 Dwellings which would total 15 dwelling uplift at 20%. This allocation is still too high as Ranby has very limited services and any increase in settlement size would lead to more traffic and pollution as car travel is the main form of travel. It is the Parish's view that proposed allocation is entirely unjustified and does not reflect the size or function of the village. It is not an appropriate level of growth for such a small, rural village. The development needs of each individual village should be properly assessed, evidence-based and then carried out sustainably. Building another 15 houses in Ranby village would be disproportionate. Ranby village has green fields and open spaces amongst the houses, and the character of the village would be severely compromised by inappropriate levels of growth. Whilst some Rural Settlements will require small-scale and sensitively located development to support local needs and to support local services and facilities, we consider that the level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Ranby will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF281 | Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England | Support the criteria at D. and E. They are suitable for achieving the right balance between meeting local housing need (rather than just market demand) without overwhelming existing settlements and damaging their character. The policy and the criteria allow enough flexibility to provide affordable housing while seeking to ensure this is done with the support of the community. The requirement for pre-application community consultation at E. is particularly welcome in this context. | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |
| 1197063 | Resident | The requirement for a 20% growth figure for small rural villages is too high. The Local Plan has not taken into account the impact of this increase in small rural settlements, or the impact that their combined growth will have upon each other. Many small villages are interlinked by roadways, Sutton cum Lound for example is a direct route from several small villages into Retford and adjoining A1. Increased growth in the surrounding villages of Lound, Mattersey, Ranskill will have a correlated impact upon the village in terms of increased traffic through the village. The cap is set at 10% for villages who do not have a 'made' Neighbourhood Plan. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Small rural settlements will remain but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF288 | JVH Planning | Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target. | Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF289 | Lichfields | Broadly support the draft Local Plan, concerned that it unduly restricts the potential for growth within Bassetlaw's Small Rural Settlements; an area of the district where housing delivery has, historically, been strongest and where individual settlements have varying capacity to be able to accommodate new growth. Accordingly, the 20% growth cap for Small Rural Settlements is considered to be unsound and should be removed from the Local Plan. We trust that the above representation is helpful and will be taken into account in the further preparation of the Bassetlaw Local Plan. | The level of growth in the revised policy ST2 is based on up-to-date evidence and feedback from the community. The policy support some growth in the rural areas where it has previously been resisted. |
| REF290 | JVH Planning | Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target. | Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans. |
| REF291 | Consultant | Suggested changes: 1. The draft Plan should revisit the arbitrary 20% cap applied to Small and Large Rural Settlements. Additional growth should be directed to more sustainable settlements such as Blyth. This should consider the relationship between employment and housing growth. The Sustainability Appraisal needs to assess this as a reasonable alternative. 2. The policy should remove reference to the weight to be afforded to local community support in determining applications as this could undermine the assessment of an application on its merits. 3. The policy should incorporate an ongoing monitoring of delivery and supply within the Parishes, with a policy basis to support additional supply in the event Neighbourhood Plan allocations are not being delivered. | Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans. |
| REF292 | JVH Planning | Object to Policy ST2, on the basis that the proposed allocation for the larger villages is already met as is the proposed allocation number for the smaller villages. The Policy goes onto say that once the allocation requirements are met only exception sites will be allowed. There is therefore a clear problem with the Plan as drafted, it is unworkable. There is a mismatch between the overall level of requirements and commitments for large and small Rural villages and the numbers set out in the Plan as a 20% target. | Policy ST2 have been revised and a new distribution of growth identified. The Policy does provide a monitoring framework for the rural growth distribution and also includes any made Neighbourhood Plans. |
| REF300 | Natural England | Note that additional housing development is proposed at both Carlton-in-Lindrick and Langold both of which are in proximity to the Dyscarr Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The policy maps of these two sites do not show the location of the SSSI. Development allocations in these locations must provide satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the proposals would not significantly damage or destroy the interest features for which the SSSI has been notified. | The proposed allocations in both Carlton in Lindrick and Langold have all gained either outline or full planning permissions as of March 2020. SSSIs will be added to the Policies Map. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF306 | IBA Planning | <p>Outline the approach to development across the District and define those ‘Small Rural Settlements’ which will be permitted to grow by up to 20% over the plan period. The Council has identified fewer ‘Small Rural Settlements’ than the ‘Defined Rural Settlements’ identified in the the Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan 2019, reducing the number of rural settlements permitted to grow from 73 to 42. The latest version of the Plan is far more restrictive than the previous which allowed growth in a far greater number of rural settlements to ensure an equitable distribution of growth across all settlements in Bassetlaw and to promote rural vitality. In reaching the reduced number of ‘Small Rural Settlements’, the Council has based its assessment of whether a settlement is suitable for growth or not on the number of houses in the settlement rather than its population. The Council considers this to be “more appropriate” (p 12 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper (January 2020)) but it is unclear exactly why housing numbers are considered to be a better indication of the size of a settlement and its suitability for growth or why the threshold of ‘50 or more dwellings’ for classification as a ‘Small Rural Settlement’ has been chosen (p 15 Spatial Strategy Background Paper). The Council suggests that its latest approach has been designed to support the vitality and prosperity of rural settlements, is more proportionate in its distribution of housing and its emphasis on employment-led housing growth, and is more inclusive (P 13 and 14 Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper (January 2020)). However, by excluding many settlements previously considered suitable for housing growth from the list of ‘Small Rural Settlements’ (thereby denying them the opportunity to grow), the proposed strategy is clearly not as inclusive and will result in stagnation in some rural settlements, damage to their vitality and prosperity, and exacerbation of existing affordability issues. Indeed, it is the smaller settlements which are most likely to stagnate without growth and so the Council’s approach is even more damaging to these smaller settlements. The Council seeks to justify its new approach on the basis that the ability of rural settlements to accommodate growth in keeping with their character and form varies (paragraph 5.1.27, page 27). Our experience that even very small settlements are capable of accommodating a small amount of additional development without having an adverse impact on their character and form as long as it is of a suitable scale and design. The above is endorsed by paragraph 67-009-20190722 of the NPPG which confirms that a wide range of settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas so blanket policies restricting housing development in some types of settlement will need to be supported by robust evidence of their appropriateness. This supports our position that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development irrespective of their size and present level of services. Policy ST2 is not wholly consistent with this advice and the Council have not published any evidence demonstrating why many of the smaller settlements in the District cannot make a valid contribution towards supporting services other villages through the provision of limited amounts of housing development. Policy ST2 is not wholly consistent with national planning policy in terms of enhancing and maintaining the vitality of rural communities and allowing villages to grow and thrive. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Many of the settlements now denied any opportunity to grow are close to other villages with services and so restricting growth in such settlements as proposed not only conflicts with paragraph 79 of the NPPF but also limits opportunities to support important services and facilities in neighbouring settlements. Cannot support the Council’s approach to rural housing growth which prevents any housing growth in many smaller rural settlements in the District previously considered suitable for limited growth and request that the Council reconsider its approach to rural housing provision and revert back to that in the 2019 Draft Bassetlaw Plan Part 1: Strategic Plan (see the ‘Defined Rural Settlements’ list in the 2019 version of the plan) and better aligned with national planning policy. If the Council are concerned about allowing housing growth in some of the smaller rural settlements on the basis that they are more sensitive to such growth, could split the expanded ‘Small Rural Settlements’ category into two groups, with larger settlements permitted to grow by 20% under the current guidance that no single proposal exceeds 10 dwellings (Section D(3)), and smaller settlements allowed to grow by 20% but</p> | <p>The Local Plans progression has been based on updated evidence and feedback from consultation. The revised settlement hierarchy identifies the most updated approach to growth across the District. Policy ST2 also provides a revised approach to rural settlements and the level of growth settlements are to receive. The approach to baseline data will be clarified.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| | | under a separate criteria that no single proposal can exceed 2 dwellings, for example. This would enable a more equitable distribution of growth across the settlements in the District and help better support the long-term vitality and prosperity of the rural area and prevent rural stagnation and the exacerbation of affordability issues whilst ensuring that growth remained proportional to each settlement and compliant with the Council's overall spatial strategy. This Policy appears to be using 1 April 2018 as the base date from which the 20% cap in housing growth will be calculated (see Section D(1) and the two Tables within this Policy). However, the rest of the plan uses data dated 30 November 2019 for monitoring purposes - paragraph 2.6 of the Local Plan states that "All monitoring data used to inform this draft plan is taken from the 30 November 2019. This applies to housing, employment and retail commitments and completions". | |
| REF306 | IBA Planning | To ensure a consistent approach is taken and that decisions are made in accordance with the most up-to-date evidence, Policy ST2 should also adopt a base date of 30 November 2019 and be reworded (and figures in the tables appropriately recalculated) to reflect this. Second, we have previously submitted representations on the 2019 Local Plan requesting additional flexibility be introduced to Policy ST2 to ensure that the 20% housing cap does not arbitrarily rule out perfectly acceptable and sustainable windfall sites in the centre of villages that might come forward after settlements had been allowed to grow up to the cap via peripheral sites. Pleased to see that Section E(3) has been amended to incorporate some additional flexibility – it now permits wider regeneration schemes and the development of existing brownfield sites within or adjoining Large or Small Rural Settlements as an exception to the 20% cap. This is welcomed, ask that this section is further amended to include reference to the redevelopment of existing sites within Large or Small Rural Settlements as well, as this would enable, say, the redevelopment of a farmstead within a village which would not fall under the definition of 'an existing brownfield site' and thus would be excluded from this exception. | The Local Plans progression has been based on updated evidence and feedback from consultation. The revised settlement hierarchy identifies the most updated approach to growth across the District. Policy ST2 also provides a revised approach to rural settlements and the level of growth settlements are to receive. |
| 1197217 | Resident | A 20% increase in housing in Carlton in Lindrick is too high a number in an area which has already seen a significant amount of new housing without any increase in amenities. It is losing its identity as a village and becoming a small town. | The made Carlton in Lindrick Neighbourhood Plan does allocate enough land to accommodate the proposed 20% growth identified in the Local Plan. This will be delivered through the identified site allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan. |
| REF309 | Resident | In previous local plans Clayworth was considered as not suitable for growth. This was something we looked into before moving to the village nearly 3 years ago. The fact that it was not suitable for growth and that it is a conservation village is what I consider being key to the village's character and presumably the council agreed with this view at the time. Concerned at the 20% growth allocation that has been applied across the smaller settlements and does not appear to consider whether they have conservation area status. To progress with growth allocation of this scale in Clayworth would be completely at odds with the conservation area status and will encourage developments of a size and nature which would not be in line with protecting the conservation area status. Has the council considered if there are specific suitable sites for this level of development within the village? There are not suitable sites. The specific character of our village will be damaged by any development on the scale being proposed. There are considerable sized developments going on in near by settlements. If they exceed their targets will that reduce the targets elsewhere? There are other issues that concern me. The last two years have seen considerable flooding to my property and others in the village. Something somewhere has changed to cause this as it hadn't occurred in the years preceding. Any development will not improve this situation and no organisation | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District.. Clayworth will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. In line with other settlements. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| | | seems interested in helping find the cause. The road network would not be able to cope with increased housing developments. Are a rural village with a rural road network. Increased traffic to and from the village or through the village is a major concern. The roads cannot accommodate this. There is a lack of services in the village and surrounding area which will not support future development. The rural nature of our village and the relatively small number of dwellings in Clayworth means that we are blessed with some wonderful wildlife as there are the habitats available to them. Development at the levels being suggested would be devastating to local wildlife, the bats, owls, etc. Welcome the council reconsidering the allocation of housing growth in Clayworth to a more manageable, significantly lower level as part of the Bassetlaw Plan. | |
| REF310 | P&DG | In previous representations raised concerns with the application of a 20% cap for growth in rural settlements at a time when rural clusters were being considered. It is recognised that the District Council has continued with the cap and abandoned the proposal for rural settlements to be treated in clusters. Continue to have strong concerns with the way in which a blanket 20% cap for growth is applied, since this is not as flexible, proactive and positively prepared as may appear. The proposals in draft Policy ST2 stipulate that proposals should not increase the number of dwellings in the Parish by over 20%. By 'capping' the number of proposals permitted within settlements would frustrate the overall aim of the National Planning Policy Framework to promote housing in sustainable locations and severely limits flexibility required during the course of the plan period in the event other sites, proven in other ways to be sustainable and deliverable, can come forward during the course of the plan period. It is understood that the Framework now builds in greater requirements for Local Plans to be reviewed but ideally policies for the supply of housing should be as flexible as they can in the first instance to support the soundness of the plan as a whole. As a consequence of this, recommend that the 'cap' is removed to make the Plan compliant and sound. | The spatial strategy and distribution of housing has been amended in the Local Plan. This includes the level of required growth in rural Bassetlaw in line with national guidance and local evidence. See policy ST1 and ST2. |
| REF310 | P&DG | Within the Bassetlaw Spatial Strategy Background Paper 2020, it states that for a settlement to be considered a Large Rural Settlement, it must have a village shop, a health facility, Post Office, Primary School and village hall. When the wider settlements adjoining Nether Langwith are considered, the settlement will have all the facilities required to make it a Large Rural Settlement. Even when the wider settlements are not considered, the village demonstrates all of these facilities, and more, save for the direct inclusion of a primary school which are within reasonable distance. Policy ST2 also highlights the instances where development within Small Rural Settlements that are not allocated within a made Neighbourhood Plan, or which exceed the 20% cap, will be supported. There must be a "demonstration of clear local community support", which could include the inclusion within a Neighbourhood Plan, pre-application consultation wherein "the majority of respondents are positive" and support from a Parish or Town Council. Until the point at which a Neighbourhood Plan is made, we would have concerns as to how this is going to be gauged. Concerns with the omission of Norton in the settlement hierarchy. | The settlements in Norton, Holbeck and Welbeck parish do not qualify as a large rural settlement. They also do not qualify as a Small Rural Settlement. Cuckney is the only local settlement that qualifies to have some allocated growth. The distribution of growth and settlement in the parish have been classified as per Local Plan. However, any future revision to the Neighbourhood Plan can look to re-distribute the growth within the parish and look at a larger number if it can be justified. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1197255 | JHWalter LLP | <p>The settlement hierarchy allows for each applicable settlement to accommodate new development which is congruous to its existing size, location and level of sustainability. This approach is considered to be a step-forward from the previous hierarchy which restricted new growth for settlements within the 'All Other Settlements' tier of the existing Core Strategy. The emerging growth allocations will allow these small sustainable settlements to appropriately expand. Consider that the current criteria within Part D of Policy ST2 is itself restrictive of growth within these villages. The start of Policy ST2, Part D states that "unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans or Part E of this policy applies, additional development in the Small Rural Settlements over the plan period will be supported provided all the criteria below are satisfactorily met, and the proposal is consistent with other policies in this plan". This paragraph is poorly worded but nevertheless implies that the criteria below will apply when a proposal is not promoted by a Neighbourhood Plan or is a Rural Exception (Part E). However, the second criterion Part D (2), directly reverts back to a Neighbourhood Plan by stating that development is to be located within an existing settlement boundary in a Neighbourhood Plan. Part D (2) is fundamentally flawed and is potentially very restrictive, as to be accepted, proposals would not be promoted by a Neighbourhood Plan but would still have to be inside a development boundary. Being located within a Neighbourhood development boundary would suggest that the principle of development has been considered and is generally supported, creating a situation where the Part D conflicts with itself. Furthermore, not every village may have a Neighbourhood Plan which would automatically mean that Part D (2) cannot be met and a proposal would not be policy compliant with the policy in its current form. This is concerning as the growth allocations are required to collectively meet a 'minimum combined housing requirement of 1090' and there appears to be only currently 9 settlements within this tier of the hierarchy which have a made Neighbourhood Plan and they do not all have development boundaries. The criteria conflicts with itself, with Part D (2) conflicting with Part D (4). Part D (4) states "The location and size of the proposal does not conflict with the existing character and built form of the part of the settlement and it can demonstrate how it responds positively to the development principles as identified by Policy ST32 and relevant characterisation studies as part of a made Neighbourhood Plan". Whilst this criteria is individually logical, when coupled with Part D (2) regarding the Neighbourhood Plan boundary, it has the potential to impose a restrictive and inflexible policy position. There are examples in emerging Neighbourhood Plans where locations are within the built form of the settlement and are sustainably located, however have been excluded from the draft development boundary. These locations would therefore not be promoted by a Neighbourhood Plan and would fall back on the criteria within the policy. These locations would be in accordance with Part D (4), however as they are not currently within a Neighbourhood Plan boundary, would not be currently compliant with Part D (2). The current wording of Part D (2) creates a restrictive approach to spatial planning, to the point where we do not consider that it is necessary to be introduced within this policy.</p> | <p>Policy ST2 has been revised following comment from the previous consultation. The Policy ultimately supports the communities to deliver their expected growth in the most sustainable way possible. In addition, it also enables additional growth where there is a clear or identified need and where there is community support. The community support element is now linked more closely with the Neighbourhood Plan process as this is easier to manage/ control and there is a legislative process to go through.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| 1197255 | JHWalter LLP | <p>But it is not necessary for the decision maker to make a judgement on where development should be spatially located. If a settlement was within a parish with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, any Neighbourhood Plan boundary would be automatically part of the statutory development plan under Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Removal of Part D (2) will not weaken the decision-maker's control over where development should be located, but will allow the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan to be read both independently but in conjunction with one another as the Development Plan. This provides flexibility and allows the decision-maker to make a judgement on the planning balance and the spatial strengths and weaknesses of each individual application. The 'doubling up' of the Neighbourhood Plan boundary within Part D (2) restricts the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan to having to solely abide by the locations set within each individual Neighbourhood Plan boundary and severely limits Bassetlaw of the ability to be proactive in the determination of where development should be located. It is stressed that whether the growth allocations, which are required to collectively meet a minimum 1090 dwellings, can be tested against each individual Neighbourhood Plan, if Neighbourhood Plans cannot deliver on allocations or settlements do not have Neighbourhood Plans adopted. It is concerning that the growth allocations would be unduly restricted by the provisions of Part D and in particular Part D (2). There appears to be no further provision for development outside of the boundaries if failure to deliver within was to occur. We also consider that Part D (1) of the policy is also unnecessarily restrictive to have a definitive growth cap of 20% within each parish. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan has a similar growth allocation for 'Small' and 'Medium' villages but these growth allocations are set with baseline growth levels, rather than a restrictive and inflexible growth cap which is suggested within Policy ST2 Part D (1). Another flaw within Policy ST2, Part D (2) is that there are emerging Neighbourhood Plans which support development outside of but immediately adjacent the development boundary in exceptional circumstances. However, Policy ST2 is not transparent or flexible enough in its current form to deal with scenarios such as this. Policy ST2, Part D requires 'all the criteria below are satisfactorily met', however in this scenario the emerging Neighbourhood Plan would support development adjacent the settlement boundary but the exceptional circumstance would then conflict with Part D (2) as it is not within the settlement boundary. This is another example of why we stress that Part D (2) is neither sound nor necessary for the decision-maker to make a decision about the location of development as the decisionmaker will consider the entire development plan as a whole anyway. Overall, the allocation of development to these villages is a positive spatial strategy providing growth to these settlements. However, Part D and in particular Part D (2) has the potential to be needlessly restrictive of development and creates an inflexible position to make decisions on where development in these villages should be located. The location is entirely predicated on where the Neighbourhood Plan boundaries are, providing that Neighbourhood Plans have been adopted in the first place, despite the purpose of the criteria to be used where the Neighbourhood Plans do not 'otherwise promote' development. To reiterate, Part D (2) is not sound and the removal of this criteria would not have a bearing on the planning judgement of the decision-maker. What the removal will do is allow for the LPA to consider the locational strengths and weaknesses of proposals in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole.</p> | <p>Policy ST2 has been revised following comment from the previous consultation. The Policy ultimately supports the communities to deliver their expected growth in the most sustainable way possible. In addition, it also enables additional growth where there is a clear or identified need and where there is community support. The community support element is now linked more closely with the Neighbourhood Plan process as this is easier to manage/ control and there is a legislative process to go through.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF316 | Fisher German | The distribution of growth amongst the Large Rural Settlements at Policy ST2 is broadly supported, with 20% growth on the existing number of dwellings in the Parish to each of the settlements outlined (Tuxford, Blyth, Carlton in Lindrick and Costhorpe, Langold, and Misterton). Concerns are however raised in respect of the Cottam former power station site (Policy ST5). The Cottam allocation is intended to make a significant contribution (25%) to achieving and meeting the Large Rural Settlements housing requirement within the Plan period. To ensure a sound Plan it is imperative, therefore, to ensure that the Council's delivery assumptions for the site are realistic. The assumptions currently made in respect of the delivery of the site are considered ambitious and may result in the Council not meeting its housing need over the Plan period. Allowing new development to come forward in villages is considered to be in line with paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF), which states that in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby". New housing in Tuxford (identified as a Large Rural Settlement) will help to enhance and maintain the vitality of the existing community and the services in nearby settlements. For Tuxford, the Draft Plan 2020 assigns a minimum housing requirement of 250 dwellings. We note that the policy states that this requirement is a minimum. This is supported. | Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for Cottam. This has been informed by Lichfield's Start to Finish 2nd Edition (February 2020). |
| REF319 | Resident | Concerns with the significant CIL reduction, the 20% cap and the methodology use in the rural growth monitoring have already been covered in Sutton Parish Council's response. My concern relates to the removal of any sense of housing allocation figure for Neighbourhood Plan areas. The previous release of the draft had a 10% housing allocation across the board with the addition of a 20% cap also across the board. Caps are not mentioned in the NPPF and the creation of them just adds another component that is totally unnecessary. The Housing allocation figure is the cap why add something more. The Housing allocation figure should also be specific to the Neighbourhood Plan community based on several factors not a blanket figure across the District. This release of the Plan totally does away with Housing Allocations and just has a blanket cap across the District Council. Instead Neighbourhood Plan teams with little expertise are expected to determine their own Housing Allocation. Isn't the District Council absolving their responsibilities as the Strategic Planning Authority? Paragraph 101- Neighbourhood Plans- PPG I would like to see the Cap Scrapped and replaced with specific Housing Allocations for each Neighbourhood Plan Community. Make life simple. Other relevant paragraphs concerning Housing Allocations in PPG are 102, 103,104 and 105. | The Community Infrastructure Levy will still apply to rural Bassetlaw in order to support community benefit and investment in local infrastructure. In terms of the overall level of growth for communities, this has been revised and updated following the consultation and is included within the revised version of the Local Plan. In addition, communities who have a made Neighbourhood Plan - such as Sutton, can continue to monitor its effectiveness and review the plan when necessary. |
| 1197268 | Resident | 1764 dwellings across the Large Rural Settlements and Carlton in Lindrick Parish is currently supplying approximately 34% of this total. A disproportionate number. Carlton in Lindrick Parish has already supplied 20% figure. Carlton in Lindrick numbers are already proportionately counting towards District's housing so there should be no more house built in the Parish. We were told a 10 year plan for the Parish. | Carlton - as a settlement - is providing 20% growth as per policy ST2. The land at Peaks Hill Farm, although in Carlton Parish, is contributing towards Worksop's numbers due to its close/ direct proximity to the north of Worksop. There is a green gap between the proposed site and the village of Carlton. |
| REF327 | Scrooby Parish | Cannot reconcile this statement of "small scale, sensitively located" developments with Policy ST2 (Rural Bassetlaw) and its drive to an arbitrary 20% increase. 20% is NOT small scale, neither is the clamour by developers to produce that 20% in ONE single development, in one build. A 20% increase to Scrooby, equating to 29 dwellings, will yield 100 more residents and increase the Parish by 35%, and 58 more vehicles and the 29 dwellings will increase the housing stock of Scrooby by 40%. In Scrooby's terms that is nowhere near "small scale". Where did this arbitrary figure come from and why is it not tested against each Parish's ability to cope with it or even desire it. | Scrooby is considered a small rural settlement and BDC acknowledge that trying to accommodate 20% within the village has been difficult through the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore the revised Local Plan has reduced the level of growth for small rural settlement from 20% to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF331 | Worksop College (C/O Teakwood Partners) | This letter comprises Worksop College's land ownership at Worksop College and Ranby House. In order to be sound, amendments are sought to the draft policies map, which does not correlate to the actual uses of the land within their ownership. The provision of additional development at SRS is supported. However, the inclusion of a cap on the number of homes that can be delivered in SRS is not considered sound, particularly where a development can be proven to be otherwise sustainable. Nor should it preclude development coming forward where exceptional circumstances are demonstrated, and this should be accounted for within Part E of Policy ST2. Clear support for the emphasis in the BLP on healthy lifestyles, new community facilities and promoting sport and physical activity, although a joined-up approach is necessary to secure some of these applications, and most notably those associated with a new athlete's track. | The spatial strategy and housing distribution for the District has been reviewed and changed in the most recent Local Plan. See updated Policy ST1 and ST2. |
| REF333 | Resident | OBJECTS to the baseline date used in the 2020 draft LP to calculate housing numbers. Reverting to summer 2018 for the purpose of calculating %age housing increase, ignores delivered, sustainable development. OBJECTS to the 20% cap on development in rural villages in Everton's "class" in favour of a minimum 30% cap; with numbers taken away from the three major settlements and the Large Rural Villages where required. And no Garden Village. OBJECTS to the subtraction of the housing pipeline from individual settlement targets. Taken together, the above demonstrates that the LPA is prejudicing sustainable development in rural villages – in favour of a new, large, unsustainable, Garden Village? Indeed, the 1090 target given to "smaller villages" to 2037, represents less than 1 unit per annum in most identified settlements. This is not sustainable development. If the LPA is not willing to restructure the proposed settlement hierarchy in favour of the Core Strategy Rural Service Centre classification (replete with 30% minimum cap); Everton should be re-classified as a Large Rural Village and have its own expansion policy. In the context of 5.2.5, Everton delivers far more services than that required – with the exception of the Doctors Surgery that can be found in the neighbouring village (and reached by bus/electric car) The additional dwellings and larger convenience store/additional services fronting the A631, would be delivered as part of a western strategic extension that would also provide a by-pass circumventing the dangerous junction at Mattersey Rd and filtering vehicles off the A631 towards Worksop. Everton delivers more than the service provision required by 5.2.5, despite lower housing numbers, demonstrates that it has been comprehensively, artificially, constrained. OBJECTS to the 1090 target to 2037 for "small villages". Indeed, the definition of "Small Rural Settlement" at 5.2.6 is woefully inadequate as a means to describe Everton. Some development on a strategic western extension has already been approved on 3 x land parcels with topography lower than the Windmill and extensive landscaping delivery for all three schemes (which puts paid to "urban grain" arguments). This latter requirement will enhance biodiversity via Idle Valley lowland species, on grade 3 poor quality/sand farmland. OBJECTS to the restriction against the development of grade 3a agricultural land. Post-Brexit, such land will not be viable for cropping with yields typically at only 3T/acre. | The revised Bassetlaw Local Plan provides a settlement hierarchy which reflects a settlements size and role in the area and will deliver either 20% as a Large Rural Settlement or 5% as a Small Rural Settlement unless otherwise promoted through a Neighbourhood Plan. Everton does have some local services, but it is not considered to be a scale in comparison to other larger settlements in the District such as Misterton, Tuxford or Carlton in Lindrick. Therefore it is considered a Small Rural Settlement and will fall within the 5% growth requirement as per revised Policy ST2. |
| REF334 | Sutton Parish Council | Rural Growth Monitoring Sutton has two sites that are not being counted in the rural growth monitoring because outline planning was granted prior to April 2018. (One of these however is incorrectly being recorded as planning was only granted in January 2019 at a judicial review 17/00300/OUT.) This cannot be unique to Sutton and the same situation must be occurring across the District. These limbo homes are not being counted anywhere, they didn't represent dwellings at August 2018 and in our case around 40 dwellings are involved. Suggest that as at April 2018 those sites with planning permissions that had a realistic prospect of being delivered should also be included in the total net commitment columns for Parishes. | Rural Monitoring Framework has been updated to reflect changes to policy and feedback from the community. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF335 | Resident | Resident of Ranby village and Babworth parish, which seems to be the “fall guy” in this plan. It is ludicrous to plan for 4000 homes in a garden village and then another 55 homes in the tiny village of Ranby. Despite what the plan says, Ranby village has only about 75 dwellings. Another 55 is not 20% anyway. Strongly object to the 20% provision in Ranby village, as this is still far too many houses for our very rural, small village. It is not in proportion. It would make an enormous difference. The village houses are separated by green spaces, which determine the character of the village. There are no shops or other services (excepting a pub, school and village hall). There is no infrastructure to support or sustain such development. Public transport is limited to a bus service, which runs very infrequently and not every day. Such development would ruin the appearance, feel and character of our village. There are some buildings and structures of historical importance in our little village, and these would also be badly affected. Please do not apply your 20% rule to Ranby village. The area of Ranby near the prison is more “concentrated” with houses and is nearer to Retford, but you have not allocated them any houses at all? Babworth is also significantly closer to the town centre. | Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019. |
| REF338 | Resident | Supportive of Bassetlaw’s economic aspirations for the district. The proposed quantity of development within Ranby Village and the Garden Village is unsound. The Local Plan fails to direct sufficient growth to its main towns and consider the level of housing growth proposed to be directed towards the rural areas is excessive and not based on sound planning principles. A sustainable approach to planning for the rural areas needs to establish an appropriate level of development to meet local needs. Do not support the level of growth apportioned to the villages and rural area which has not been evidenced based and does not reflect the levels of growth which are actually required to support the rural area. The level of development being proposed across both the large and small rural settlements is arbitrary (in particular a proposed 20% growth target for the large and small rural settlements) and will cause harm to the overall sustainability of the district. With regard to Babworth, the Parish is a large rural parish comprising predominantly a farming community. The parish has circa 250 homes within the parish boundary and the largest settlement is Ranby. Policy ST2 of the Local Plan subsequently seeks to allocate 51 dwellings towards Ranby on the basis of that comprising a 20% uplift to the settlement’s size. It is entirely unjustified and does not reflect the size or function of the village which currently only has c.78 dwellings. | The Local Plan proposes the majority of growth, in this plan period, in the larger settlements across the District. There is some growth directed to rural Bassetlaw - including the development of a garden village and the regeneration of existing sites. Worksop however is receiving the largest share of development. |
| REF345 | Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council | If the figure of 1090 for the smaller rural settlements is spread then surely if one area takes a big chunk of those because the community have planned for it and in terms of planning there is good sustainable reasoning behind then surely some kind of bank of properties could be created prior to each 5 year review that can then be reapportioned likewise any windfall developments could be banked too then smaller sites who don’t want development should be able to bid for property numbers from the bank to protect their own numbers. Our housing numbers are wrong for Holbeck and Welbeck and Norton and Cuckney. In the parish of Norton and Cuckney there are 176 Properties: Cuckney 106, Norton 70 In the parish of Holbeck and Welbeck there are 119 Properties: Hobecks 96, Welbeck 23 | Noted. The number of dwellings for Cuckney and the parish have been checked with our Council Tax department and updated. |
| REF345 | Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council | Could housing allocations across plan areas be shared out so if one NP area has reached its allocation plus 20% it can offer out its excess to other areas in simplistic terms. | Only amongst settlements within their designated neighbourhood plan areas. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF351 | Resident | <p>It is proposed that each Small Rural Settlement (SRS), into which category Lound falls, has its Housing Requirement doubled from the previous 10% to 20% of its size in 2018. This is too many and that Council's own figures demonstrate that this number is not required. The evidence collected by our Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group over the last 4 years shows that there is a general acceptance of 21 new houses (10%) but that a doubling of this is unsupportable. The number of houses required by your Draft Plan is 1090 in the SRS category, yet the 20% requirement shown in Policy ST2 will provide 2124 houses, a 100% over-provision. If many villages are already using the 20% requirement then there is no need for other SRSs to struggle to supply an unpopular increase in their requirement. In Lound the infrastructure, drainage, power supply, etc, will not support such a large increase. Our village has infrequent public transport that is essentially unusable, and thus new houses will depend on private transport. This is against several of the stated aims of the Draft Local Plan, i.e. to increase sustainability and to mitigate climate change. The Local Plan emphasises the provision of smaller/starter homes, which SRSs like Lound are unlikely to provide. Policy ST2 states that for Large Rural Settlements that 'Unless otherwise promoted through Neighbourhood Plans...' they will provide 20% growth. SRSs do not have this reference to Neighbourhood Plans, and this apparently diminishes the importance of Lound's Neighbourhood Plan. Suggest that the requirement for a 20% increase within SRSs be reduced to 10% with a provision for more development if their Neighbourhood Plan supports this according to local needs. This will still provide your requirement and will produce a fair result.</p> | <p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p> |
| REF352 | North and South Wheatley Parish Council | <p>Considering the specific issues for North and South Wheatley, have some concerns over the proposed development at Cottam. Welcome the use of a brownfield site Cottam is relatively isolated, on the west bank of the River Trent and with poor road links to the surrounding area. The proposal to build 450 houses by 2037 and a further 1150 houses after that would have a major impact on the surrounding villages; in particular the traffic flow through Leverton (on the principal route to both Retford and Gainsborough) and Sturton (on the principal route to Gainsborough). North and South Wheatley may be less affected by traffic but we would expect some increase in flow of traffic heading to other destinations such as Doncaster. The plan mentions the requirement for additional health care provision and school places but there is little detail provided. Considering the likely change in the demographic make-up of the population the need for additional health care provision for older residents would be the more pressing concern. The plan acknowledges that rural bus services are poor and with an older population likely to be less able to drive their own cars then the matter of public transport to and from Cottam will have to be addressed. Finally, North and South Wheatley is one of the Small Rural Settlements nominated for a 20% (maximum) growth between now and 2037. This is a sizeable increase (up to 53 houses) in the size of the village and will doubtless cause concern to some of our residents yet it pales into insignificance when set against the potential development at Cottam and the Bassetlaw Garden Village.</p> | <p>The spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy has been revised following additional evidence and feedback from consultation. See Policy ST1.</p> |
| REF363 | Resident | <p>East Markham the figure of 524 dwellings within the neighbourhood plan area, with a 20% cap of 105 houses. However in the settlement the number of dwellings falls to 481 with a cap of 96. It is my contention that the settlement area should be the figure used. Also changed the date to 1st April 2018 for which planning applications towards this cap are valid. This severely disadvantages my village which has approx. 60 applications approved and being built which will be disqualified from the cap. Given all the building work at present taking place in the village and the fact that no infrastructure improvements to roads and services have taken place east Markham should be exempt from any additional development from the period of this plan. Policy ST2 The statement in Para E5 makes a complete nonsense of the 20% cap by virtue of it being able to be overridden. Wary that this 20% cap is not a national policy but an arbitrary figure plucked out of thin air by B.D.C. and could be overruled by a Planning Inspector.</p> | <p>East Markham is considered a 'small rural settlement' and therefore will only support 5% growth from 1st April 2018. The Rural Monitoring Table has also been updated to reflect the change in classification.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF365 | Resident | In order to generate figures for the 20% cap on projected growth, each of the 73 settlements was assessed as to its current size. This exercise involved drawing boundary lines around each settlement, which were then used in conjunction with the District Council's Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) database in order to calculate the number of dwellings. The figures were generated and deemed current as of 13th August 2018; the full set of figures is included here as Appendix 6. The boundary lines drawn around each settlement were produced solely for this purpose, and should not be confused with the development boundaries that currently apply to some settlements in the district, as defined in the 2011 Bassetlaw Core Strategy. For reference purposes, the maps produced for counting the number of properties in each of the 73 growth settlements are included here as Appendix 7. The 10% housing requirement figures, applicable to designated neighbourhood plan areas and provided for guidance purposes for not-yet-designated areas, were calculated on the same date using the same database (see Appendix 6). | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |
| REF373 | Residents | Concerned regarding the potential for 51 new build houses in Ranby Village: Applied for planning permission to build one house on our land which BDC refused back in 2004. Appealed and the refusal was upheld. In 2018 we decided to apply for a change of use to our existing garage and games room which was also refused for the same reasons (there is no need for any further housing in Ranby). These reasons being: - Policy 5/3 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan as modified indicated that residential development within settlement envelopes will be permitted only if in character with the area, provides adequate residential amenity, does not create traffic problems and does not set an undesirable precedent. The eastern part of the village is characterised by open fields with large dwellings set in spacious well planted grounds, giving an open, leafy character to the locality. The proposed development (of one house only) would result in a more cramped form of development at a prominent position at the edge of the village, to the detriment of the character and spacious appearance of the area as a whole. As such, the proposed development would be wholly contrary to the aims and objectives of the policy of the Local Plan (If this is the case for one house, surely 51 should never be considered). | Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019. |
| REF374 | Resident | Express my dissent to the proposed increase in housing numbers to be built in this historic rural village. The village gave their answers to a questionnaire in 2016 and after considerable work and effort it was reluctantly agreed to a future increase of 10% in housing requirement. New proposal of a 20% increase in the size of the village is unsustainable. Such a large increase in population will have serious adverse effects on the character and amenity of the settlement. BDC's own report states that "the housing requirement of 20% must result in a settlement which is capable of accommodating the level of growth proposed." Lound is not capable of such a large increase in population. The infrastructure and services are already failing, the sewerage system is already overloaded, drainage of surface water problematical. Lound has no shop, no school, no drs surgery, the bus service is so infrequent and expensive (£6 return to Retford) meaning that any resident of Lound could not rely on public transport to go to work in any other area. Therefore travelling by car is essential, thereby increasing car use in the area. As a result of the Lound Neighbourhood Plan we, as a small rural setting, agreed a target for new homes but this huge increase is totally unacceptable and there is clearly no local community support. I also believe that the sale of any new properties would be difficult due to the lack of facilities for young families. Hopefully you will agree that the original plan should be reinstated and that BDC housing requirement (which apparently has been exaggerated) can be made up by extra numbers in, perhaps, the Garden Village which will have to have the necessary school, surgery and shops. I hope this exercise, which must have cost a huge sum for local tax payers, will soon be agreed and concluded satisfactorily. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF375 | Resident | The proposed 51 houses at Ranby be included in the Garden Village | Noted. Thank you for your comment. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF385 | Resident | At the meeting on Thursday 13th February in Tuxford an official of the planning department said that the planned growth of the villages would be about 20% until the towns (I presume Retford and Worksop) slightly higher. Historically towns grow much faster than villages consequentially Worksop and Retford should be growing at about 60%-70% and the villages at about 6%-8%. In an area of a growing economy having about the same level of building growth everywhere will result in a shortfall in housing in the towns and an excess of houses in the villages. The price of town dwellings will increase causing people at the bottom of the property ladder being unable to buy property. The prices in the villages will drop causing people to travel much more increasing the carbon footprint and pollution, and congestion. To sum up build in an area of a growing economy against market forces at your peril. However, Bassetlaw is a very deprived area. Worksop has still not recovered from the closure of Manton Colliery and the exodus of the textile industry. Collieries close to Tuxford such as Bevercotes, Ollerton and Thoresby which at the sometime held the European coal extraction record for a years' output. This coupled with the rundown of supporting manufactures such as DOSCO (1 mile outside Tuxford dropping from a workforce of 750 to 250 people) has had a huge impact on the local economy. There are no signs of anything that will create real growth this and other deprived areas should be exempt from the national housing scheme. One day a BBC TV news man went to Washington near Newcastle and stood amongst 200 dwellings saying that a year earlier the builder was just finishing them and yet not a single one had been taken. He went on to say that they were all lying empty and yet in the south of England, people were queueing out for property. To sum up build in deprived area at your peril. Further to build a garden village on farmland where there is no hope of employment beggars belief. | Tuxford is considered a Large Rural Settlement due to its size, level of services and the role it provides to other settlements. Tuxford is a very constrained settlement and it is difficult for the town to grow naturally. However, a number of sites have been put forward to be considered for development and these were consulted on late last year and early in 2020. The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which provides the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two. |
| REF390 | Resident | Housing – need for social housing especially bungalows as part of the 39% for Dunham on Trent Our bus service is nearly non-existent, if the sites at Cottam and High Marnham are developed (even if they are not). A regular bus service from Worksop, via, Retford. Tuxford – Lincoln! Via Saxilby. There are many not clearly sign posted and not accessible in the winter months. Pavement joining up all villages will promote access and public health and economic prosperity. Village Fledborough to Ragnall to Dunham on Trent – Darlton and to Tuxford with good pavements people could walk instead of using cars and access public transport. The same for South Leverton to Treswell from Laneham to Rampton. Also joining up Cottam and High Marnham will improve the whole accessibility of the area, while not taking away the rural aspects. | There is a need for more specialist and affordable housing in rural Bassetlaw. Some communities are preparing Neighbourhood Plans for their areas to help manage development and influence the type of development in their locality. Connectivity is also important through bus services and public footpaths. The Local Plan is supporting the enhancement of existing public footpaths and encourages new developments to provide additional ones where appropriate. |
| REF400 | Resident | Ranby village has been allocated too many houses although we live in the parish of Babworth. The village is not able to cope with the number of houses allocated we need to know where the planned building's will be and what will be built. | Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF401 | East Markham Parish Council | <p>While provision of the plan is overdue and welcome, East Markham Parish Council has little faith that it will be followed by BDC based on the scale of development within the village in recent years. At the last census, (2011) East Markham had 490 dwellings, this had increased to 524 by August 2018 representing a rise in Housing stock of 5.7%. In contrast, Clarborough and Welham (also defined as a small rural settlement within the plan) has seen an increase in dwellings from 480 in the census to 495 by August 2018. This represents an increase of 3.1% in their housing stock. The increase in dwellings over the last 9 years has produced a lot of pressure on narrow village roads. Recent construction of dwellings on Beckland Hill and High Street have seen serious increases in congestion on the village's roads. Development has increased further in the last 2 years. Since April 2018, East Markham has seen 110 properties been either built or approved. This takes the housing stock of the village over the proposed cap within the lifespan of the plan. The Parish Council views the cap as meaningless. Request that BDC view each planning application in the wider context of development in the village rather than on an individual basis. There are 59 houses either being developed or approved around Mark Lane / Beckland Hill. Little apparent thought appears to have been given to the impact that these separate developments will have on roads and drainage in this area. Repeatedly raised concerns about the safety of the Mark Lane / Beckland Hill Road Junction but these have been ignored. Ask that road safety measures are introduced at that point to safeguard our residents. Request that BDC review access to the village. There are only two entrances left for traffic to the village, whereas there used to be four. This is funnelling traffic onto Askham Road, Farm Lane and Beckland Hill. This increase in traffic represents a danger as is evidenced by three car crashes on this stretch of road during the past 12 months. Requests that the access from the village from the A57 to High Street (Western Entrance) be reinstated to take pressure off traffic around the School on Askham Road, and also for the Priestgate to West Markham road over the A1 to be repaired and reopened. The infrastructure of the village has not kept pace with development is with regard to drains and sewers. In February 2020 the village has suffered from the discharge of raw sewage from drains close to the school. This was attended by Severn Trent but the problem recurred twice again that month. Church Street has also experienced raw sewage flowing across the road in front of the actual Church. There has been repeated flooding of residential properties in both York and Low Street. The Village's neighbourhood plan has a specific policy NP7 relating to this. There is little evidence that BDC have considered this in recent decisions. Recent development already has had an adverse impact on the character and amenity of the village. The proportionate cap of 20% has been in existence for some time but there is little evidence that BDC has taken character and amenity into consideration. The 20% proportionate cap is not Government policy but is BDC policy. In the event of a conflict between BDC 20% cap and the Governments no upper limit EMPC seeks clarification as to what takes priority.</p> | <p>The Council has produced and updated its rural monitoring table. This is directly linked to planning applications and the number of dwellings identified in Policy ST2. The table will be updated and published monthly. In terms of highway issues, this is down to NCC and their advice at the time of commenting on planning applications. The proposed 20% for East Markham has now been reduced to 5%. The base date for the monitoring of any competitions is 1st April 2018. The rural monitoring table provides the most up to date picture in relation to planning permissions and the level of growth identified for each community in Policy ST2.</p> |
| REF407 | Resident | <p>How do we find the actual figures that BDC has produced against the Government figures for local housing 'need'. The 20% increase in housing in BDC is unrealistic and damaging. What is the national Government figure please?</p> | <p>The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment has been updated which provides the justification for the housing and employment targets and the balance between the two.</p> |
| REF416 | Residents | <p>The draft local plan has been changed to increase the housing requirement to 20% from 10%. Strongly object to this very unwelcome increase. Our Parish Council steering group found that the majority of residents in Lound thought that no new housing is needed. We reluctantly agreed to 10% but we do not want 42 new properties building in our small rural village. The infrastructure in Lound would struggle to cope with this number of properties, our roads are narrow and congested already. There is ample scope for more building in Retford to fulfil your required 20% increase across the county, where there are sufficient facilities and amenities whilst we have none. To reiterate we strongly object to more housing than 10% being built in Lound. There is no need to crowd our narrow road or swamp our infrastructure more than it can cope with.</p> | <p>Policy ST2 has now been reviewed in response to comments made during the previous public consultation. Lound is still considered a 'small rural settlement', but the level of growth has been reduced from 20% to 5% over the plan period. The rural monitoring table has also been updated to reflect these changes.</p> |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF417 | Resident | Would prefer the allocation of 51 homes for Ranby be allocated to the Garden Village as the infrastructure for the village would not be able to cope with the increase of traffic and also there is no amenities (i.e. shops) in the village. | Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. |
| REF423 | Resident | There are not 250 houses in Ranby village. The A1 should be resurfaced with silent tarmac. The entire length of the A1 facing Ranby Village should be fitted with a sound barrier as on the motorway between Geneva and Montreaux. | The A1 and its upgrade is the responsibility of Highways England and not Bassetlaw District Council. |
| REF424 | Resident | Please comment on maths base number how delivered 255 as only about 100 in the village itself therefore 20% = 20 not 51 dwelling increase? Also, where has been chosen for the 20 new dwellings? | Ranby is classed as small rural settlement and will now only receive 5% growth in line with the revised policy. Babworth is considered too small to receive any "planned" growth. However, through the production of a Neighbourhood Plan, it is down to the community to decide how the 5% growth is distributed. The number of existing dwellings assessed to apply the growth is for the whole parish and not just Ranby village. Therefore the figure of 255 is correct as of 2019. |
| REF426 | Resident | Bassetlaw are talking about creating jobs that at present there is very few or none. | The Local Plan also includes land for jobs. These are located on proposed allocated employment sites or through existing sites around the District. The plan also supports smaller and rural businesses. |
| REF455 | Resident | Surprised to hear that Lound's Housing Requirement has doubled from 21 to 42 and believe this is just too many. The lower figure seemed acceptable but the local services and infrastructure will struggle with a substantial increase. Public transport is inadequate so an undesirable increase in private vehicle movements will result and as a householder who has twice had raw sewage on his lawn in recent years due to blockages in elderly pipework (a link to the main drain from several dwellings on Town Street passes through my property), the existing foul drainage system will surely struggle. I do not consider it "Nimby-ism" to protect the appeal of small rural villages and size is a key factor. Some people like to live in smaller quiet communities as I do whilst others prefer the convenience and facilities of larger urban settlements. Planning should respect such preferences. I am most unhappy that the considerable time and diligent effort has been spent by our (voluntary) Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group appears to have ended at the very least in considerable frustration and no doubt there are costs incurred by the Council which as a taxpayer also grieves me if the exercise proves to be partially wasted. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF456 | Resident | Lound Object the plan to double the initial plan for 21 new dwellings is mainly the increase of traffic which is already dreadful with the increase we have seen and induced of heavy lorries, through the village the roads are not able to stand this constant battering and our roads are badly needing repairs and any more traffic is madness. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF457 | Resident | As a resident of Lound must protest of the high handed decision of BDC. Regardless of what was agreed in 2018, it has now decreed that Lound should accommodate double the amount of housing agreed previously. Why? Records show it is not needed. Furthermore, the infrastructure is not adequate to support a greater influx of housing and people ect. The Council must realis this, if the details have been studied! It may be necessary in the future- but not now! Please reconsider, and have the honesty to admit you were wrong. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF458 | Resident | You wish to increase the new housing requirement by 100%. The locals have worked hard on a village plan with due consultation with the local inhabitants. This is unnecessary as Lound is a small charming village with few amenities. Cannot think who would buy these extra houses. The bus service is very infrequent, there is no school in Lound nor a village store or post office. I wonder who will be able to afford, even the ones already agreed upon, without increasing the number of new homes. There has been a significant increase in nearby Sutton (which does have a few more amenities) and none of these have sold so far in the area on Lound Low Road. I consider that this decision has been made in haste, without credible thought for those who would wish to occupy these homes. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |
| REF459 | Resident | Appalled to see that the draft BDC Local Plan 2020 proposes to double the increase in dwellings previously required for Lound. Villagers had reluctantly accepted an increase of 21 houses (10%) but the new proposal is neither desirable nor necessary. Such an increase with place extra pressure on the local infrastructure. The village was expanded over recent years on a result of infills and conversions. Drains regularly do not cope with heavy rainfall as it is. Starter homes are unlikely here. Employment opportunities in the area are very limited. Newcomers will mostly be commuters by car or by car and rail from Retford to other towns/cities. They will also need to drive to and from Retford to access essential services and facilities. This is not eco-friendly and is at odds with government policy. There are many recent current and planned housing developments in Retford and the surrounding area including the large new village destined to replace Gamston Airport. These are more than sufficient to meet the BDC requirements. Lound is a village with character. It would be a pity if this be lost as it is gradually engulfed in urban sprawl as have so many others nationwide. Trust that the 10% increase in housing for Lound need not be exceeded. | The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%. |

| REFERENCE NUMBER | ORGANISATION | COMMENTS | OFFICER RESPONSE |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| ST02 - Rural Bassetlaw | | | |
| REF460 | Resident | <p>The steering group in Lound submitted their draft Neighbourhood Plan to the Parish Council for approval. Understand that the draft Bassetlaw District Council Local Plan now shows a 37% increase in housing requirement in Bassetlaw by 2037. The Lound target for new homes has been double in what is small rural village. This is wrong and completely undermines the basis on which the Lound Neighbourhood Plan was created. The Neighbourhood Plan village survey in 2016 showed most householders wanted little or no new housing development. Part 1 specified a minimum of 21 new homes. Lound's draft Plan was subsequently adjusted to meet this target and would protect the village from unsuitable development. This figure has doubled to 42 new homes, calculated 20% of homes in Lound Parish. This is totally unacceptable and not sustainable and undermines all the hard work done by the village Neighbourhood Plan Committee. Also, it does not consider the resident's views on the type of future village development needed. Bassetlaw's reputation has now been strongly damaged. Understand the village steering group, which includes Parish Councillors, has rigorously protested with Bassetlaw officials regarding their unbalanced method of finding the higher figures. This change in housing numbers wrongly punishes the small rural villages like Lound. Through the Neighbourhood Plan, villagers in Lound have undertaken what was required from Bassetlaw Council and cannot support the additional new increase in housing to How can the Strategic Objectives, enhance the quality, diversity and character of rural villages? The character of Nottinghamshire small villages must be protected and maintained for future generations and should not be spoilt by Bassetlaw's inappropriate planning decisions. Lound, as with many other small villages, does not have the infrastructure to support this additional housing growth demand. The village does not have any shops, has drainage issues, poor public transport and a sewage plant at capacity. Plus, the high cost of current housing and future housing, limits any potential interest from low income families. Revise your policy and accept the housing volume laid out in Lound's Neighbourhood Plan and consider the implications and damage to the unique character of Lound if ignored.</p> | <p>The Local Plan policy ST2 has been amended to reflect the feedback from communities across the District. The revisions to the policy acknowledges the hard work communities have, or are, undertaking through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Lound will remain a "small rural settlement", but the percentage of growth has also been reduced to 5%.</p> |
| REF475 | Resident | <p>Rural development policies – support The villages in Bassetlaw can accept further growth. Too much may strain road links and resources.</p> | <p>Noted. Thank you for your comment.</p> |
| REF480 | Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council | <p>Recognise the need for housing within the District and the responsibility for rural communities to support some additional building. Question how those villages with local plans will support a 20% growth after the extensive consultation that has already taken place. Note that in one presentation BDC spoke that some villages may support with a higher level of development. Yet to identify these locations.</p> | <p>The majority of made Neighbourhood Plans or Neighbourhood Plans that are currently in production have all either considered, have or are planning to, accommodate the 20% level of growth. Some settlements have not due to issues of land availability, deliverability or planning constraints. This is reflected in the revised policy ST2.</p> |