

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1177432	Resident	This is an excellent idea. The site is very accessible and takes the pressure off housing demand in surrounding towns where the existing infrastructure may be poor. The new location of the garden village makes sense. Could this be increased in size if necessary?	The size of the site is the full extent of the land available for a garden village.
1180212	Resident	I think this is an excellent development.	Support noted and welcome.
1189264	Resident	The idea of a garden village (small town) so close to Retford and adjacent to one of the main routes into and out of Retford seems to be ill thought out. Where do you think people are going to work, shop, commute to and from? Roads in this area are already congested. Access into Retford along both the A620 and B6420 is already bad at peak times. It pretty clear this development wont provide sufficient jobs to employ the new residents so it will effectively create a whole load of new commuters to the more developed population centers such as Lincoln, Doncaster or Sheffield.	The site will provide 15ha of employment land to provide residents with jobs and a local centre and community facilities to meet everyday local needs. Additional work on traffic will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
REF018	Resident	Traffic congestion, the roundabout on the A1 is already very busy and the level crossing on Mansfield Road is a main line. This already causes traffic congestion and a further 750 homes would have a huge impact on this. The cross roads at Babworth again are busy and the road is not equipped for this. The crematorium as already massively contributed to the volume of traffic and I feel the road as become unsafe especially the Babworth junction. The A1 closes frequently or diverts traffic at least once a week if not more often, this again will only add to the volume of traffic. Live on Old London Road and all the congestion already as an impact on this road. This development will only force more traffic down this single track lane which is not fit for purpose for the current amount of traffic. The road can only accommodate one car at a time and can spend more time on the grass verge allowing other vehicles to pass. The road is frequently used by ramblers bikers and horses and safety would also be a huge concern as the road as several blind spots and speeding is also a problem. Previously reported these concerns to the council & highways, this proposal would only make the situation far worse.	Additional work on traffic will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.
REF047	Sport England	Para 5.3.19 and policy ST3 it is important that the evidence is available to inform sports and active recreational needs across the district and within the Garden Village. Sport England supports the plans to develop a Built Sport Facilities Strategy as part of the evidence base. Para 9.4.9., Ensure that Active Design is considered as part of the development process.	A Built Facilities Study is being produced. Once approved, together with the existing Playing Pitch Strategy it will inform future policy development. Active Design will be incorporated into the master planning of the site. Reference will be added to Policy ST3 to reflect this.
REF054	Resident	Should also mitigate for noise and maintain public right of way.	Policy ST3 makes provision for connectivity to the public rights of way network. Policy ST3 will be clarified to ensure the existing right of way is maintained. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure the amenity of existing and future residents is protected.
REF061	Resident	A Garden Village is a good idea, It will focus major development in one area and allow villages to have smaller developments which will better reflect their history and the environment.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1191848	Barnby Moor Parish Council	If it is built on redundant sites, not farm land.	The Local Plan makes good use of previously developed land and minimises the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. But inevitably there are not enough suitable, available and deliverable brownfield sites in the District to meet identified development needs. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2.
REF085	Retford Civic Society	Recognise that a new village could add something new and exciting to Bassetlaw. Support the proposed development at Five Lanes End as this site has great accessibility both to the trunk road network and to local towns. It is essential that this development does not start until there is a mechanism in place to ensure that retail and other community facilities, including public transport services, are in place at an early stage to serve residents. Many community facilities require a certain population to be viable and this applies particularly to the possibility of a new rail station. To ensure a successful development it may be necessary to increase the scale of building permitted in the first phase of this development.	Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.
1193061	Resident	This is a purely aspirational plan. Do not see any real evidence to justify the need for a new town development so close to Retford and Worksop. Employment would be a major issue unless the new residents are to commute to major cities. Would need to attract a major employer to the area supplying senior and less skilled jobs. Are there any plans to do so?	The site will provide 15ha of employment land to provide residents with jobs - the aim is to attract different types of businesses to diversify the economy and provide better skilled and higher paid jobs.
1193338	Resident	The building of a new garden village seems sensible as the location sees it within a short distance of the A1. No problems with this development.	Support noted and welcome.
1193555	Resident	The location of the green village as not be considered. It too near climber park sssi that already got a large impact with visitors already. More information on how this going to be built and mitigation they could be provided.	Additional work on potential visitor impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at visitor impact from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1194464	Resident	<p>Need to determine which this proposal is, It is named both a "Garden Village" and a "Garden City". Is the idea to lull the communities senses by using the "Village" name and later transforming this to a "City" ? Good productive farmland is to be used to the detriment of the nations ability to produce sufficient food crops. The proposed Rail Station will not be built either at all or until well into the proposed development if it goes ahead. This is an economic fact of life, along with all of the other services "promised". You do not have any guarantees that I am aware of that will ensure that these developments are included with the housing plan. The nett result will be more overloaded services in this area with additional traffic thrust onto the already inadequate road system and inadequate support services. No matter what 'screening' is used there will be intolerable traffic noise from the adjacent A1 Major Trunk Road which must be in line, at some point in the near future, to be upgraded to a Motorway. Who will wish to live close to this Heavy Traffic Route and the subsequent disturbance ??</p>	<p>The site will be a Garden Village but designed and built to reflect the Government's Garden City principles. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Once adopted, Policy ST3 will set out the infrastructure that any development at the Garden Village would be expected to provide. Without such provision planning permission would not be granted. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure the amenity of existing and future residents is protected from noise for example.</p>
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Additional consideration should be given to the need for off-site improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in vicinity of the Garden Village. Due to the existing rural location, existing walking and cycling routes are designed for low levels of usage, which could be adversely impacted by the additional usage brought by the development unless appropriate mitigation is undertaken to improve these routes. Whilst part 4 (a.vi) refers to improvements towards links direct to facilities including Retford and over the A1, it does not account for nearby pedestrian and cycling routes that could be utilised by residents for leisure and recreation. The Garden Village is approximately 1500m to the south of the Chesterfield Canal. There is potential for the canal to provide a local leisure resource for new residents as part of a wider circular walking or cycling route, which could help to meet the future open space and leisure needs of future residents, which could promote physical wellbeing and active travel. The towpath, and other existing public rights of way in proximity to the site, are designed to meet their current levels of relatively low use. The Trust maintain assets to a steady state based on existing usage. Any additional usage brought about by the Garden Village could result in additional liabilities, including the erosion of footpath surfaces, which could discourage long term use of the local pedestrian and cycle network for travel and leisure, contrary to the general aims of paragraph 104 (part d) of the NPPF. Consideration is given towards the need to ensure that nearby walking and cycling routes are sufficiently robust to accommodate the likely demands brought upon them from the new development. This could be met through the addition of an additional requirements within part 4.a) of the policy so that it is made specific that improvements to the wider walking and cycling network are considered. Suggested additional wording is provided below: "Improvements to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in proximity to the site to accommodate the future demands of residents, including account towards routes used for leisure and recreation". Alternatively, expansion of the explanatory text to include reference to the need for the potential use of the existing walking and cycling infrastructure to be considered.</p>	<p>Off site connectivity by walking and cycling will be part of the policy progression and the masterplan process.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF116	Network Rail	<p>Whilst the provision of a station in this location could be supported in principle much more work has to be carried out as the provision of a new station is dependent on a number of factors. Service provision on this line has been increased to a consistent 2 tph under the current Northern franchise (including an hourly Sheffield to Gainsborough Central train) which could offer a reasonable level of service. However it would be required of the promoter to provide an evidence-based demonstration that any new station:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is technically feasible – precise location, engineering, signalling etc. • Has the support of the Train Operating Company • Can feasibly be served within the timetable. <p>The 3rd point is the important one. Whilst this line itself is not especially busy, passenger services feed into Sheffield via Nunnery Main Line Junction which is a very busy pinch point. Timetabling services through this junction is a difficult exercise and thus it is not a simple matter to add 2 to 3 minutes (our estimate) to journey times by the insertion of an extra stop. Whereas it may be technically feasible to locate a station in the vicinity of the previous one (Checker House) would first advise a timetabling exercise is carried out to assess the impact an additional stop would have on the performance through Sheffield. As an alternative may wish to talk to the East Midlands franchise about the possibility of extending the current Nottingham to Worksop service through to Retford, but again that is dependent on the turn round times at both Worksop and Nottingham as well as the availability of platforms/crossovers at Retford and any further rolling stock that could be required. It has also to be borne in mind that a fully accessible station will cost in the region of £6-10 million (based on recent station construction at Low Moor and Apperley Bridge in Yorkshire); a long term projection of around 4,000 dwellings would be able to support such investment but clearly there will need to be substantial upfront costs to deliver the station. In terms of level crossings, there are two and possibly three crossings that could be affected by the proposals (see map). These would be namely Howard's No.1 (61m 11ch), Mansfield Road (62m 24ch), and possibly Rushey Sidings (62m 44ch). Our starting point is that the closure of any level crossing is very welcome, given level crossings represent the biggest single risk to the operation of the railway system. Howard's No.1 is a simple occupation crossing which as far as we are aware has no right of way over it, and as such it would be our starting point that the crossing be closed completely as part of the overall scheme. Bridging Mansfield Road would also be a positive development but that would also be dependent on securing enough land on the north side of the railway to facilitate bridge and approach embankment works on that side of the railway – this will involve third party ownership and if we have a reluctant landowner the Council may have to seek CPO powers to deliver this. A thorough transport assessment would be required to assess the risk at the crossing (and also the Rushey Sidings crossing – as this is a current half barrier crossing it is considered to be more of a risk than the others). An alternative, given a strategic look at the road network in the vicinity of the Garden Village, would be a possible closure of Rushey LC to vehicles and its diversion over Mansfield Road. This should be considered as part of any overall assessment.</p>	<p>A rail feasibility has been undertaken which states that all three points identified can be met. This report has been agreed with Network Rail. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on traffic and rail will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will include impact on level crossings and potential solutions to address impacts identified.</p>
1194662	Resident	<p>Support development of Housing /support infrastructure at the A1 / A614 junction because of its good transport links and possibility of new Rail interconnection to East coast main line. Location centrally within the district</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1194992	Resident	Support housing and development but believe that sustainable villages should be created based on existing settlements rather than creating a new one. Pg 39 refers to a new railway station. I think it would be better to reactivate old stations eg Tuxford. The A1 /A57 junction is also notorious for accidents. On the connecting roads travelling to Wilko / Greencore etc there are very narrow A roads which lack street lighting in places. With a new DHL more traffic will be using this already busy junction and without substantial improvement this would be dangerous. The only way to widen the roads would be by eating into National Trust land and this should not be done as it compromises green space. In the document you also highlight that Worksop is not attracting investments so why would a new garden village just up the road? There is no quality employment in the area and as such people wanting to earn salaries which are capable of buying expensive houses ie East Markham £450 - 750k would need to commute to cities so not helping the environment etc. Comments about cycling trcas etc while good in principle are unrealistic in the context of the wider area. Cycling to the villages or Retford is not realistic. Agree there should be new cycle routes but not sure that trying to create them here would work, just lead to routes that go nowhere. Overall I think that there should not be a garden village here. It would be more cost effective to develop existing villages like East Markham and Askham and Darlton rather than build a new one. Pg 44 Worksop struggling to attract investment. I would say that a lot of this is down to having staff unable to work effectively to attract this. HR team are very poor at identifying talent. Also need to be emphasis on stopping anti social behaviour, reducing crime , drugs and alcohol etc to make Worksop an attractive place to visit especially at night. People want to live in safe neighbourhoods.	The Garden Village is required to help deliver the District's housing and employment needs. It will provide a wide range of housing and jobs, including better paid and higher skilled jobs. A Transport Assessment will be required to ensure that all impacts on the road network are identified and mitigated. There used to be a railway station on the site at Checker House. Although that has been demolished the site would reintroduce a station in this location.
REF140	Resident	Firstly, the creation of Bassetlaw Garden Village. The location is ideal, close to employment opportunities at Manton Wood. Easy access to A1 M18 and M1 without impacting on Worksop or Retford town centres. The new railway station would link up to Retford's East Coast mainline giving easy access to London York etc This new site of at least 750 dwellings takes the pressure off further expansion on existing towns and villages in Bassetlaw.	Support noted and welcome.
1195216	Resident	Appley Head is the wrong site. Brownfield sites should be used such as Bevercotes	The Local Plan makes good use of previously developed land and minimises the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. But inevitably there are not enough suitable, available and deliverable brownfield sites in the District to meet identified development needs. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Bevercotes has been discounted as a potential site because of its biodiversity value.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF163	Resident	<p>The Green belt location of this proposal is absolutely unacceptable. It is unbelievable that green agricultural land that is currently being actively farmed is going to be converted into a housing estate. This will cause a loss of farming land and have an impact on the agricultural industry locally. It will also be depriving the future generation of nature and natural wildlife. Preserving a few trees is in no way comparison to the wildlife that live here such as grass snake, owls, herons, swallows, stoats, buzzards to name a few. Our children are devastated that the life we chose to live in is going to be ruined due to lack of planning by the council. It is going to completely alter the countryside character of the neighbourhood. Putting 4000 homes (starting initially with 750 and to work up to 4000 houses according to the plan) in this area will overwhelm local services. Local schools will be unable to cope with this number of pupils. Although the plans propose that contribution will be made to local schools it will in no way meet the potential extra 4000 pupil requirement (assuming each home has 1 school age child, although this number could be double or treble as most families have more than 1 child). The plan to build a local primary school is not clear and appears to be a modular method which would not work as student population cannot be restricted to building a school in stages. This proposal will also put the local residents at risk of flooding with excessive houses going up in higher ground putting those of us living in lower ground at risk. Not to mention the impact of increased traffic on the local residents, intrusion into our privacy, disruption to our life and other pollution that will be created such as noise. We live in the country and the council is robbing us of our right to enjoy this by surrounding us with 4000 houses and thus affecting our amenities. This will also cause loss of green view to the neighbourhood. 4000 new homes will also mean more cars and will have an impact on the locals already living here and we will be subject to increased traffic and the pollution this will cause. The plan to build a station in the proposed area is unclear with no definite funding. The council will be held accountable by the local residents if they fail to deliver on promises made as per the consultation plan. Currently the houses in this area are dispersed and are not overlooked. As a result of putting 4000 houses on top of us will result in intrusion of our privacy and being overlooking. There will be overshadowing and loss of light that we currently enjoy. The council is also going against planning policy by building on Greenbelt. The NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) clearly states it is inappropriate to create new developments in areas that are not already in areas of settlement especially in greenbelt areas. Therefore, this plan is clearly going against National Policy.</p>	<p>Bassetlaw does not have a green belt. However, the Garden Village would be built on greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Additional work on ecological impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at the type and mix of biodiversity on the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. There will also be a requirement that at least 10% biodiversity net gain is achieved on site and that a significant amount of additional trees are planted to enhance the site's ecological value. Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development including for education and health. The requirements for infrastructure are agreed with the infrastructure providers such as Nottinghamshire County Council (education) and the Bassetlaw PCT (health). The site is in Flood Zone 1 (low probability of river/sea flooding) but further work will be undertaken in relation to surface water run off to inform the site's drainage strategy. Additional work on traffic impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. The design of the development will ensure residents continue to enjoy private amenity without adverse impacts from noise.</p>
1195356	Resident	<p>However this is a way to large development but at least its not in someones back yard , however more care with the green aspect should be taken and the amount of housing reduced</p>	<p>The number of homes identified is needed to deliver a sustainable new community. Delivering the green agenda is a key theme for the Garden Village and will be embedded in its design.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF166	Resident	<p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 3. Plan-making The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings. Plans should: a) be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development; b) be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable; c) be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees; The Garden Village is 216 hectares of farmland where there is no existing infrastructure in place. Consequently as part of the development all of this will need to be done, which leads on to the aspiration but deliverable point – in the NPPF. With no details sitting under the proposed plan how can it be categorically stated that all of developments proposed for the site can actually be delivered. When asked about sewage, planning leads responded with the utilities companies have said that there are innovative solutions that can be used, but when challenged what these are, there are no details as yet therefore how can this be modelled financially to see if it is viable? Also the plan lists the development of a train station. When asked, this will not happen in the first 10 years of the plan, and funding has not been identified –again aspirational but is it actually deliverable – Network Rail and the train companies maybe in favour of the development but in reality who is going to pay for this to be built? The last point in this section is around community engagement. I acknowledge that yes there has been communications and consultation events held, but I must also point out that the Parish / Area that is going to have the biggest impact from the proposed Garden Village, the consultation event was held shortly after the publication of plan was made on the Council’s website, and held in the afternoon when working people would not be able to attend. The community has had to ask for a second consultation event at a time suitable for working people – which is now scheduled for the day before the consultation closes. This does not give the local residents much time to formulate a response to the consultation. The council may have discharged their legal requirements in engaging with the residents, however the “low key” communications about the proposals has meant there is a distinct lack of awareness about the plans and the impact. The majority of the local people are not aware of what is being proposed, and when discussing this with them 95% of the locals do not want agricultural land destroyed for housing developments and planning department need to come up with an alternative solution. NPPF, para 122. Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account: c. the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use; d. the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), or of promoting regeneration and change; Are at odds to what is being proposed. As the site will be built on farmland there is little or no existing infrastructure, the B6420 road will require major improvements to be able to cope with the additional traffic this will bring, the railway station will not be built in the first 10 years of the plan with no funding identified, a primary school will be built at some point (no identified trigger point) therefore the initial new families will have to travel (probably by car) to the other local primary schools. The draft infrastructure plan that is provided as part of the supporting documents states that there will need to be New access to the B6420, but no mention as to how the road will need to be drastically improved to cope with the additional traffic the Garden Village will cause. What are the plans for the level crossing, the notorious “S” bend at the Rushley cottages (where 2 attempts at improvements to reduce accidents have been made in the past 7 years, but still accidents occur on a frequent basis). This is the only reference to the B6420 Mansfield Road, so I am assuming from this that no other alterations will be made to a very busy cut through road to the A1. Also the plan states there will be a transport hub as part of the developments. But as already pointed out there is no guarantee that the railway station will be built as the funding for this has not been identified and also as there are a distinct lack of shopping and leisure facilities in the Bassetlaw area it is more likely the residents of the Garden Village will still use their cars to drive to Lincoln, Gainsborough or Meadowhall. One of the advantages being used for the location is the proximity to the A1, however this also means that people will use their cars to get to the retail and leisure facilities that is sadly lacking in our area. So I envisage that far from limiting future car use, this location will actually increase the use of cars. Also the 2nd point is about maintaining the character of the area. This won’t happen as the site is currently rural Retford - fields, trees, hedgerows, open green space etc and will be replaced by 4000 houses and other developments. This is evident</p>	<p>The NPPF also provides support for new settlements as a means to deliver sustainable, long term housing growth. The Garden Village was at an early stage in January 2020. As the Local plan progresses more information in terms of infrastructure is put together. The next version of the Local plan will contain more detail. The consultation for the Local Plan was consistent with legislation, and additional events were added to the programme in response to community demand. It is important that events are held in the day and evening to give as many people as possible the opportunity to attend.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village	<p>from the change in the last version of the plan that was consulted upon as Section 8 of the old plan Rural Bassetlaw has been completely dropped as the Garden Village proposal completely contradicts the principles the original plan had. Section 8.11 from the plan was:8.11 Following a comprehensive assessment of all 103 settlements in rural Bassetlaw, 30 settlements have been identified as either too small or too dispersed in nature to support additional housing development without this having a detrimental impact upon their character. A list of these settlements is included in figure 7 at the end of this chapter. The areas around the proposed site (Morton, Upper Morton and Little Morton) were listed as settlements not suitable for small scale development at that time, but now faced with a complete oxymoron in that the proposal would amount to 4000 houses being built on the site. The plan is contradicting previous principles applied and also not demonstrating why this should be progressed. Likewise on Historic England's website there are entries shown in their Non-Listed sites – Pastscape and Heritage Gateway on the proposed sites – Crop Markings in the fields, Morton Hill Farm and buildings (the plan does not detail what will happen to these), & an irregular series of linked enclosures (quite dense) including one circular feature. Will these historical features be retained or destroyed? From a personal perspective my family and I are residents in the area and will be directly affected by the plans. Point 5 in Section 5.3.8 of the local plan states: Strong local vision and engagement: designed and executed with the engagement and involvement of the existing local community, and future residents and businesses. This should include consideration of how the natural and historic environment of the local area is reflected and respected.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF166	Resident	<p>1.4.1 In accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2020) and the Local Plan Regulations the Council has engaged with stakeholders, including residents, businesses, developers, statutory consultees and other interested parties to ensure that their views inform the Local Plan production. So far there has been no engagement, and I appreciate these are draft proposals, however as part of the consultation process I feel I need to represent our views now so the Council are aware. The residents of Morton have not been consulted until now about the location of the proposed Garden Village. The development will have an adverse effect on the area, by reason of (among other factors) noise, air & light pollution, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, - currently not subject to any of these issues as there are very few properties in the neighbourhood, and most properties are surrounded by open fields. Residents made a choice to move to this rural location, a choice that the Council are planning to take away from us, with no input until this plan was published. There is also some coal mining works in the vicinity of the development. Therefore are the council confident that there will be no adverse effect on the existing properties by developing on land with mining works in close proximity? Also how will the natural and historic environment be respected as the plan is to put 4000 houses on top of the agricultural land, which is home to multitude of species despite contrary belief – field mice, voles, rabbits which also mean there are predators present in buzzards, owls and foxes who use the fields as their hunting grounds. Also sighted in the area are grass snakes, herons, swallows. Finally if the plans do make it to final development stage how will the council ensure our privacy, security, and amenities are safeguarded and that we are not disadvantaged by the developments? For example the water supply is fed via Morton Hill Farm. I would also like to point out the previous planning applications that have been made were either rejected, including appeals or were subject to very strict conditions about use and conversions. These decisions were based upon not keeping with the character of the area and the lack of infrastructure. In summarising I am totally against the proposed Garden Village site being situated on 216 hectares of green belt land to the detriment of the existing rural life and character of the area.</p>	<p>The NPPF also provides support for new settlements as a means to deliver sustainable, long term housing growth. The Garden Village was at an early stage in January 2020. As the Local plan progresses more information in terms of infrastructure is put together. The next version of the Local plan will contain more detail. The consultation for the Local Plan was consistent with legislation, and additional events were added to the programme in response to community demand. It is important that events are held in the day and evening to give as many people as possible the opportunity to attend.</p>
REF169	Highways England	<p>The Bassetlaw Garden Village has been proposed to accommodate a total of 4,000 dwellings, note that given its complex nature the target for this Local Plan period is limited to 750. Any development coming forward on this site should note that as the eastern boundary abuts the A1 trunk road, boundary treatment works and drainage will need to be considered to ensure the structural integrity of the network is not compromised. In addition, 22.1 ha of employment land is to be completed, 108 ha of new employment land is to be found and at least 199.6 ha of strategic employment land is to be allocated to address employment need and/or expansions to local businesses.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with Highways England so that master planning will ensure that the structural integrity of the A1 is not compromised.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	<p>The revised Local Plan is a great improvement of the previous plan especially with reference to the development of Gamston airfield and Bevercotes pit. Accept your proposal for a “Garden Villages” is very contentious and note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a new village does move forward recommend that further research should be carried out to consider the possibility of developing an alternative site at West Burton before the final decision is made as the road system and positioning of the site is mid-way between the two large conurbations of Retford and Gainsborough and there are already services and facilities already in place to aid the homeowners before their own are built. • There is insufficient capacity on roads for the proposed increase in use. • The impact on the road network of any of the proposed sites that have been consulted on shows that all the sites would likely increase traffic flow on rural lanes, which are not suitable for additional traffic. • accept that the proximity of both the A1 and the rail links for the proposed Village site at Applyhead has merit, however the A1 already is highly used and when accidents occur this impacts on all roads around Retford and surrounding villages. • No consideration or evidence is included to show the effects of pollution from the A1 covering the area proposed due to increased traffic. • The loss of a significant portion of Green Belt is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which specifies it as a justifiable constraint on housing delivery. The Local Plan documents give no detail of the Exceptional Circumstances which could justify release of Green Belt. • The Garden Village site confirms that the impact on the environment, in terms of congestion and pollution, will be considerable because of the reliance on cars as the primary means of transport. • The open fields and hedges serve a very useful purpose in mitigating for the locations poor air quality as well as providing open countryside for the residents of Rural Retford’s wellbeing. • The Local Plan proposal identifies loss of biodiversity opportunities with increased urbanisation, especially with the loss of field systems and hedgerows. It also identifies the loss of significant portions of Grade 3 agricultural land which is currently producing food products. • Cumulatively the impact will be detrimental to the whole area. 	<p>For a site to be considered as a Garden Village it must be submitted by the landowner as available for development. West Burton is still operational and the owners have not indicated the site is available for development. Additional work on traffic impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The traffic assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. Policy ST3 requires an air quality assessment be submitted to ensure impacts of development on air quality are identified and appropriately mitigated. Bassetlaw does not have a green belt. However, the Garden Village would be built on greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Additional work on ecological impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at the type and mix of biodiversity on the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. There will also be a requirement that at least 10% biodiversity net gain is achieved on site and that a significant amount of additional trees are planted to enhance the site’s ecological value.</p>
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal states that if the Garden Village goes ahead, some of the houses will be built before any additional infrastructure is provided. This will add pressure to local facilities which are already overstretched. The quantum of houses proposed may not bring the required infrastructure benefits. • Consideration / commitment does need to be given as to how the Council can ensure that at what stages the additional infrastructure must be provided also what percentage of land within any “Garden Village” will be allocated to open/ green and leisure spaces. • How do they intend to link a cycle routes between any village and the nearest large conurbation? There is a risk that the Garden Village will be undeliverable for some or all of the factors mentioned already, in which case the promise of infrastructure solutions for the district as a whole to be delivered by the Garden Village will not materialise. There is also the risk that the developers will choose not to deliver the housing in large enough packages because of financial factors such as market conditions. Developments could also be subcontracted to smaller builders, putting any or all of the promises of infrastructure at risk because of viability issues or even market collapse. The greater risk to the district, then, if the Garden Village is not delivered, is that the wholesale scatter gun approach to development across the district will continue adding housing without any infrastructure, only this time it will build on open spaces and the Green Belt. The strategy has very little to do with what the district needs or wants and does not reflect in anyway the results of the engagements with stakeholders to produce a shared vision. 	<p>Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development. The requirements for infrastructure and the timing of provision are agreed through discussion with the infrastructure providers. Clarification will be provided as to how much land will be publicly accessible open space, formal sports pitches and wildlife areas. Additional work on sustainable transport provision, routes and connectivity to the existing network will be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The Garden Village will only be taken forward in the Local Plan if it can be demonstrated that the site can be deliverable. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment states that all infrastructure associated with the site can be delivered as part of a financially viable scheme.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1195911	Aspbury Planning Limited	Support the proposal for a new garden Village in the District. However, this is another completely 'new' major addition to the housing supply in the 2020 Draft Plan alongside the former Cottam Power Station and again there is little information in the public domain to substantiate delivery of the first 750 dwellings alongside the essential infrastructure necessary to establish a new settlement within the timescales suggested. It is unsafe to therefore rely on as many as 750 dwellings coming forward in the plan period requirement. In this regard it is also essential that ST14 is robust in delivering its share of housing requirement for the main towns and we consider that additional additional sustainable sites should be added in (including our clients holding at Welham Road) to compensate for likely under-delivery at the new garden village and/or the regeneration led new settlement at Cottam.	The spatial strategy will be re-visited as part of the progression of the Local Plan
1196000	Resident	In principle, am in favour of a new garden village being constructed, and don't see any obvious barriers to using the site proposed here. Its closeness to the A1 means it will not require extensive new road infrastructure to access it. The proposal that, in the period up to 2037, are targeting upwards of 750 homes suggests that target is unlikely to be more than 1000 in that first phase. It seems that it would be more appropriate to build a higher number in the first phase, pushing for this to be a fully formed village at the earliest opportunity. This will require ensuring appropriate services are in place sooner - e.g. healthcare, schooling, shops, etc. - which would reduce the environmental impact of the new villagers travelling into Worksop, Retford or elsewhere in order to reach those services. This would meet your green targets more readily, especially as it may not be so necessary to build so many houses in other villages. Fewer houses in other villages would mean there's less need for providing such services in the other villages as well - or for the villagers to have to travel in order to reach those services.	The Garden Village site will have a long lead-in time before development can start to ensure all necessary permissions are in place and the site can be safely accessed and all of the necessary utilities infrastructure can be put in place. It is not practicable to do this any earlier in the plan period so it is reasonable that about 750 homes are expected by 2037.
REF198	Consultant	Within the whole of this section there is not one statement to substantiate how this greenfield site allocation conforms to Strategic Objective 1 which requires the minimal loss of good agricultural land. With the exception of a small concrete apron adjacent to the railway, it is all farmland. Do not support the formation of this new garden village on the basis that the need has not been proven and that its formation is totally against the aims of Strategic Objective 1. The use of this site for employment, particularly for storage and transport based industries, is to be supported.	Objective 1 supports a balanced approach to growth across the urban and rural areas, making use of previously developed land and minimising the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. The site is required to achieve the wider aspirations of the D2N2 SEP and the Bassetlaw Local Industrial Strategy - increasing the number and type of jobs in the District. This would require additional housing which will provide greater resilience in housing delivery and contribute to improved infrastructure and services in the long term.
REF198	Consultant	Para 5.3.14 This suggests a local plan need of 750 dwellings to help meet local needs but the 5 year HLAA does not show or support this level of need. This need therefore much be identified and proven.	The housing needs assessment shows a need for the number of dwellings identified in the Local Plan. It is that figure not the LAA that is used to identify the housing numbers for the Local Plan.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent support the principles behind the Bassetlaw Garden village and raise no objection to the proposed allocation of the site at Upper Morton. Welcome the opportunities to be part of the stakeholder groups for developing a plan for the Garden Village. Severn Trent would note that it is important that all allocations, including the Garden village consider water efficiency, drainage, and sewerage from the outset. One of the fundamental principles is that the village should be dominated by high quality Biodiverse landscape and green infrastructure. Support this approach and highlight the need to incorporate Blue Infrastructure alongside the green infrastructure creating blue-green corridors that will support an enable wildlife to thrive. This blue infrastructure is also key for the sustainable management of water, returning surface water run-off to the natural water cycle as good quality through the use of SuDS, and ensuring that the good quality water can be then reach watercourses or groundwater to support sustainable abstraction for use as potable water. The plan is to retain a connection to the rural setting, through the inclusion of trees, and vegetated areas. Support this but as there is also a need to create blue - green connections through the development. The benefits of creating these corridors include the opportunity for promoting sustainable transport, by incorporating of footpaths and cycle ways alongside key infrastructure such as SuDS and watercourses to convey surface water safely through the development ensuring that water quality and opportunities to enhance local amenity are incorporated as well as the quantity aspect of SuDS design. It is important that the Garden village is designed, with the whole lifetime of the development in mind. It is essential that infrastructure is located and designed to be adaptable and resilient to changes. Additional pressures, including climate change, urban creep and further growth and development can then be managed sustainably whilst retaining the sense of place and high quality development. The utilisation of SuDS should assists with this process, in particular the use of source control SuDS. Consideration of wider benefits including opportunities to create priority Habitats should also be considered especially where this can be undertaken as part of multifunctional space. Longer term ownership and maintenance of key infrastructure is usually, clear cut with a specific utility company / council department being the appropriate authority or the responsibility being that of riparian ownership. In more recent years the provision of services through management companies or multi-functional spaces with shared responsibilities has created some confusion. Recommend that a management and maintenance plan for the Garden Village is developed, and that this is kept as a live document to prevent maintenance of the development compromising the overall design. Support "Maximise the effective use of natural resources including Energy and water," within paragraph 5.3.11 and "Sustainable drainage should be fully integrated within green infrastructure as part of a bespoke wildlife friendly scheme."</p>	<p>Support for the principles of the Garden Village is welcome. The Council will continue to work with Severn Trent so that policy development and master planning appropriately addresses the requirements of blue-green infrastructure. Policy ST3 makes provision for an integrated SUDS/green infrastructure scheme. Further work will be undertaken with Severn Trent to ensure the policy wording is fit for purpose both now and in the future. Additional text will be added to Policy ST3 to identify arrangements for stewardship of blue-green infrastructure.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF201	Severn Trent	<p>Note that these have been included within supporting text but would recommend that the drainage hierarchy, SuDS and water efficiency are specifically mentioned within Policy ST3 as it will be key to ensuring the viability of water supply assets in the longer term and the resilience of the sewerage network. The following could be used as an additional bullet point in section 1 of the policy to highlight water efficiency: "All development should be design in accordance with the optional water efficiency target of 110 l/p/d, as per Building Regulations Part G". Note that Building Regulations part G paragraph 2.8 states that the optional rate is only applicable where a condition is applied stating the need to meet 110 l/p/d. By defining the need to meet this standard in the Local Plan, developers will know that this will be a design requirement from the outset enabling them to account for it within their costs and early design, it will also assist with the implementation of conditions to deliver this optional target. This would support our recommendation that a statement is specifically included within the policy. The following could be used as an additional bullet point within section 5 of the policy to highlight the drainage hierarchy: All applications for new development shall demonstrate that all surface water discharges have been carried out in accordance with the principles laid out within the drainage hierarchy, in such that a discharge to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible. Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 80 (Reference ID: 7-080-20150323) Highlight the need to protect existing watercourses and retain these assets as open features. Current best practice is to retain watercourses as open features within areas of public open space, the approach is covered by blue green thinking, the creation of blue green corridors, focusing on the need to make space for water, and the benefits that this approach can have on flood risk and biodiversity. To this effect recommend that the bullet point 5 heading is changed to Blue-green infrastructure. Recommend that an additional bullet point in section 5 is added to highlight the protection of additional watercourses as indicated by NPPF, for example Development should where possible, create and enhance blue green corridors to protect watercourses, and their associated habitats from harm. Whilst section 5 of Policy ST3 Bassetlaw Garden Village makes a positive statement in regarding integrated design and multifunctional space in point c) "An integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional greenspace:", it does not specifically mention SuDS or highlight the need to undertake SuDS design in accordance with best practice which has 4 areas of focus, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity as well as Quantity. Recommend that a bullet point is included within section 5 to highlight this need, for example All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are put in place unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. All schemes for the inclusions of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four aspects of good SuDS design, Quantity, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity, and the SuDS and development will fit into the existing landscape. The completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure that the SuDS are maintained in perpetuity. Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs. Note that the LLFA should be consulted on the wording regarding SuDS, as they have the main responsibility to advising the LPA on surface water / SuDS design considerations. The Garden village is within a SPZ 3- would advise that the Protection of Groundwater Sources are considered for the development.</p>	Comments noted. The proposed recommendations will be added accordingly to Policy ST3.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Strategic Highways: The policy is understandably broad-brush, the County Council supports the need for a Planning and Development Brief in the form of a SPD to be prepared and adopted to provide more specific requirements in due course. Part D, 4- The B6420 provides the only way in from the GV site boundary. There are two adjacent 90-degree bends beyond the site boundary that need straightening out by a realignment. This is potentially a significant constraint and therefore should be included within the policy as a separate named requirement. Part D, 4, (iii). - The B6420/A620 junction is poor and probably will require the installation of traffic signals, subject to TA, and potentially land to widen the approaches. This should be secured as part of the GV development rather than a contribution towards the works. The 4 (vi) ped/cycle links to Retford would require more land too. Part D, 4, (vii). - This requires a new railway station. A supporting rail technical note suggests that the provision of a new railway station will require closure of 3 level crossings in close proximity. It is not clear why and whether this 'must' happen. ST3 ought to include a review of the operation of the level crossings including appropriate mitigation which may include crossing closures and a new road over railway bridge(s) to accommodate all traffic. Part D, 4, (vii) - Contributions are likely to be needed for public transport facilities and potentially initial rail subsidy. Policy ST3 D4 should highlight this requirement.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with NCC Highways so that policy development and master planning appropriately address the requirements of transport infrastructure. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. A rail feasibility has been undertaken which recommends that the level crossings be closed for safety reasons. This note was agreed with the County Council. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on rail will need to be undertaken including impact on level crossings and potential solutions to address impacts identified.</p>
REF222	Notts CC	<p>Minerals and Waste: Policy ST3 states that the garden village falls within the Mineral Safeguarding Area/Mineral Consultation Area (MSA/MCA) for sand and gravel. Confirm that the land identified by the red line boundary for the garden village does not fall within an MSA/MCA and therefore this wording can be removed. Education: Primary - given the 3,250 dwellings proposed to be added to the Garden Village after 2037, a new 630-place (3 forms of entry) primary school would be required as part of the layout of the Garden Village for which land and contributions would be required in order to accommodate the full size of the settlement. The school would need to be located in the heart of the Garden Villages https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/793682/Education_provision_in_garden_communities.pdfSecondary: NCC anticipate a small surplus of places in this area, so pupils arising from housing developments in the Local Plan could be accommodated at existing schools. The proposed Garden Village would necessitate the addition of a further c500 secondary places, for which contributions would be required. Potential expansions of existing secondary schools would be subject to feasibility. If circumstances at the time of a formal application had changed – i.e. changing population, school rolls and school capacities – and a new secondary school was required in this area, NCC would also need developers to contribute land.</p>	<p>Confirmation that the site lies outside a Minerals Safeguarding Area is noted. Policy ST3 will be changed accordingly. The Council will continue to work with NCC Education so that policy development and master planning appropriately address the requirements of education infrastructure to ensure that the most up to date position is reflected in emerging policy. Additional work on education impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The assessment will look at the projected modelling of population growth, school rolls and capacities to determine what mitigation is required to address the issues identified.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1196559	Resident	<p>Here we are again using perfectly good agricultural land to 'pave over' thus increasing the risk of flooding and destroying the ability to produce much needed food for the nation. Does nobody at the Council understand that farmland is not being made anymore ?? The myth of Public Transport, with a Railway Station no less, will take a lot longer to realise than the building of many houses that will introduce more vehicle movements along with the Traffic Hazards and Pollution. Does the Council really think that people will walk or cycle to Worksop/Retford or a Railway Station (if built) ?? The other infrastructure required (Shops, Chemists, Doctors etc) will not happen until a large number of the houses have been built and by then the habits and customs of driving to Supermarkets will have already set in. The proposal is to build houses close to a major highway. This will inevitably lead to Noise Pollution and present a poor picture to the Visitors that we currently bring to this attractive part of Nottinghamshire and Great Britain. Further, there is anecdotal evidence of plans being accepted for houses and then different styles/sizes being built.</p>	<p>The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. A rail feasibility has been undertaken which states that a rail station is feasible. However, it is acknowledged that additional work on rail will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will timing and cost of provision. Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development. The requirements for infrastructure and the timing of provision are agreed through discussion with the infrastructure providers. Additional work on sustainable transport provision, routes and connectivity to the existing network will be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The design of the development will ensure residents continue to enjoy private amenity without adverse impacts from noise.</p>
1196560	Resident	This is an appropriate area for development with links to nearby work places and transport.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF239	Resident	Concerns about the Garden Village are: 1) The disruption created for all of the residents to the Parish during the build. 2) There will be a large increase in demand on all of the transport links in the area. 3) The A1 already struggles in multiple areas with flooding and the large amount of traffic it currently sustains – currently requiring re-routing through Retford which brings the town to an almost standstill. 4) The Garden Village will attract buyers from out of the area who will then commute to the cities and London thereby providing limited benefit to the local residents. 5) The increase in population will impact the transport links to the two immediate towns of Retford and Worksop. Parking in those locations will be difficult and the facilities not provided in the Garden village stretched in those towns. 6) Can the local hospitals deal with the increased demand? 7) It is suggested that there will be a rail station provided. This would impact on the current travellers journey times but worse if they were no station and they sought to commute by train the two rail stations (Retford and Worksop) already struggle to deal with the car parking required. 8) The rail company providing the transport is already substandard and has had to be intervened by the government.	Inevitably construction will lead to some disruption through the build. But the Council will work with developers to ensure this is kept to a minimum. Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified. Policy ST3 provides for a mix of housing on the Garden Village to meet identified local needs including affordable housing, housing for older people and for families. Further work will be undertaken to determine the infrastructure required to support each phase of the development both on site and elsewhere. Bassetlaw PCT have confirmed that a financial contribution will be required to mitigate adverse impacts expected from a development of this size on Bassetlaw Hospital. A rail feasibility study states that a new railway station in the Garden Village could be achieved without disruption to journey times. This has been agreed with Network Rail and the train operating company.
1196689	Resident	The proposed Garden Village is not appropriate and the housing should be added to Retford and Worksop whose main street shops are in urgent need of more customers.	It is important that the Local Plan promotes a balanced approach to growth across the District. Worksop and Retford are being allocated a fair proportion of planned growth. It is expected that residents of the Garden Village will use facilities in Worksop and Retford for none day to day activities.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF247	Babworth Parish Council	<p>With the proposed development sites (Garden Village and Ranby, in particular), is the proposed land: - Part of an estate, which is to be sold off? - Part of existing farmland? - Part of existing woodland? If the answer to some or all of the above questions is 'yes'. question the Local Plan's ambitions of conservation and the maintenance of our greenfield sites. Like assurance that the Local Plan has investigated the development of brownfield sites, rather than opting for the 'easy option' of purchasing greenfield sites from a couple of landowners because it is easier and ticks a box.</p>	<p>The Local Plan promotes a balanced approach to growth across the urban and rural areas, making use of previously developed land and minimising the loss of the highest quality agricultural land. The Garden Village would be built on predominantly greenfield - mostly agricultural - land. National policy states that planning policies must give consideration to agricultural land and where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The proposal uses Grade 3 agricultural land which is lower quality than Grade 1 and 2. Six of the housing and employment allocations are on brownfield land but inevitably there are not enough suitable, available and deliverable brownfield sites in the District to meet identified development needs. All sites are put forward by the landowners/site promoters. The Council does not purchase greenfield sites from landowners to include in the Local Plan.</p>
REF249	Pegasus Group	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 52) acknowledges that..... The Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan seeks to allocate the Bassetlaw Garden Village a site of 216ha as an area of long-term sustainable growth. It is suggested that this Garden Village could deliver up to 4,000 dwellings over its lifetime with a target delivery of 750 dwellings over the plan period. The recent Uttlesford Local Plan Stage 1 Inspectors Report highlights the problems which can be associated with a reliance upon such sites without clear and robust delivery evidence. In the case of Uttlesford three Garden Communities were proposed. The Inspector acknowledged that the Garden Communities would be responsible for the delivery of a large amount of the housing requirement. In considering the Garden Communities the Inspector identified they would not deliver the quantum of housing in the plan period that the Council's trajectory was showing. The Inspector was concerned about the lack of evidence to enable a conclusion to be made that the proposed allocations were sound and that they would deliver sufficient levels of housing over the plan period. In relation to Garden Village it is identified by the Local Planning Authority that: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland ..." Whilst it is concluded that this location has been identified as being more suitable, it is not without its constraints. It appears that the Council has been 'wedded' to the delivery of a Garden Village or Garden Villages without consideration of suitable alternatives. In addition, there is significant scope for a slippage in the timetable. Prior to development commencing, post BLP adoption, a significant amount of work is required to overcome the identified constraints, develop the identified required masterplan and appropriate infrastructure. It is probable that the timescale identified for delivery could slip leading to an under-delivery in the plan period for this site. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer. If appropriate the Bassetlaw Garden Village proposal must be founded upon clear and robust evidence together with a realistic delivery timetable.</p>	<p>Acknowledge that delivery of Garden Villages comes under careful scrutiny. The Council will revisit the delivery timeframes to ensure that they are robust and achievable.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF253	Fisher German	The Garden Village is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan, the Council's delivery assumptions for the site must be 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. In progressing the Garden Village allocation, it is considered that a robust review of the sites deliverability, including start dates, build out rates and having regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades, should be undertaken to ensure a sound allocation and Plan.	Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	The Draft Plan's proposal for a new Garden Village between Worksop and Retford is particularly innovative and to be welcomed. The Garden Village will provide the basis for a substantial number of new homes and new employment land, with development shaped by a comprehensive set of sustainable development principles. Note the strong emphasis in the Draft Plan on active travel within and beyond the new Garden Village and would be particularly keen to ensure that this element of the proposal continues to feature highly as ideas develop. Importantly, the Garden Village proposal also includes provision for a new public transport facility including a rail station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line. This is to be welcomed and will complement other initiatives in SCR which are looking to improve this route as well as strengthen rail connections to Sheffield City Centre from the east. The Sheffield City Region Integrated Rail Plan (July 2019) provides more detail on how we see these services developing in the future.	Support for the Garden Village, particularly a new railway station on the Sheffield to Lincoln line is noted and welcome.
REF257	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Encouraged by the commitment to biodiversity, as well as the reference to public transport links, eg the railway station. What would the implication be to Morton, a hamlet, in terms of traffic? Would Morton be swallowed in a future large development, after 2037?	Additional work on transport impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. The transport assessment will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and what, if any, mitigation is required including for Morton to address the issues identified. The Garden Village is expected to be developed over two plan periods. The site boundary is the extent of the whole development planned for post 2037.
REF262	West Stockwith Parish Council	In general, in total support of the new plan especially the creation of the "Garden Village".	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1196906	Resident	This element has the thoroughness that might be likened to a poorly conceived GCSE planning project drawn up by a 17 year old. Appreciate that the policy is based on available land which might generate little or no objection, available links to major transport networks and housing development pressures forced upon Bassetlaw by Sheffield Authority and elsewhere BUT to use this isolated area with a convenient link to the A1 and the local rail network has to be reconsidered. This raises serious concerns for the future 'Garden Village' community and its' surroundings that this apparently simple tick box house building exercise conducted by Bassetlaw DC can answer. The current 'community consultation' for this strategy has been within this consultation document and a single piece of laminated A4 tied to a sign alongside the B6420 (now destroyed by the weather) as I understand it. I support the 'community consultation' process outlined in this section to alleviate the issues I perceive to be inherent in this strategy. My request is for this to be FULLY ADVERTISED in the communities of Retford, Ranby and surrounding areas with SIGNIFICANT SIGNAGE visible to road users erected on site to highlight this consultation process.	Planning for the Garden Village is at an early stage and further work on transport and infrastructure impacts will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. These assessments will look at the projected modelling of potential vehicular trips to and from the site and the impact new development will have on all types of infrastructure to determine what, if any, mitigation is required to address the issues identified to ensure that sustainable development is promoted. The consultation for the draft Local Plan was conducted over 6 weeks and was fully compliant with all relevant legislation and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This included through local media, with parish and town councils in Retford, Ranby and surrounding areas with site notices used along the road frontage.
1196906	Resident	Bassetlaw DC is struggling to tackle to the issues facing Retford, Worksop and other public centres with significant retail business closures. Creation of another community which may face similar issues MUST demand that these issues be addressed before any such a proposal can be developed further. My concern is of a dormitory ghost town where economic growth directed towards centres such as Doncaster or Sheffield rather than locally.	The Garden Village will be a sustainable new settlement that will provide for living and working in the same location. Additionally the Local Plan provides for about 108ha of employment land for business growth. A key priority of the Local Plan is to reduce the amount of out commuting to Doncaster or Sheffield. Providing improved transport links to new employment sites in Worksop and Retford and elsewhere in the District will help ensure that this is achieved.
1196906	Resident	The destruction of 216ha of arable farmland and likely hedgerow habitat MUST demand a full carbon offsetting calculation to prove the objective of this statement. Low carbon in this statement should be replaced with zero carbon if Bassetlaw is committed to a truly sustainable future for it's communities and population. As stated earlier there is a single inclusion in this policy document of a strategy towards electric vehicle use from 2030 onwards. Electric vehicle infrastructure must be included in this 'Garden Village' strategy to have significant meaning.	A Natural Capital Impact Assessment will be undertaken for the site to identify the current level of natural capital and ecosystem services on site and then to ensure that a gain is achieved through master planning the site. This would include carbon storage, carbon sequestration, air purification, noise regulation, water flow, water quality, pollination, accessible nature, horticulture production, and biodiversity. Further work will be undertaken to determine whether zero carbon can be achieved as part of a financially viable scheme. The use of electric vehicles in the Garden Village is supported by the Local Plan and infrastructure will be required to be put in place to enable charging in new development.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1196906	Resident	Support the housing allocation of this strategy in principle particularly where it develops brown field or existing communities. Have reservations of a 'Garden Village' dormitory development which is questionable in terms of it's value to the existing local communities particularly Retford and Worksop and the environmental impact due to carbon loading that such a development, with increased vehicle movement and with improper planning might create.	Support for brownfield development welcome. The Garden Village is intended to be a new settlement and is not associated with meeting the needs of existing communities. It is identified to achieve the wider aspirations of the D2N2 SEP and Bassetlaw's Local industrial Strategy. Additional housing will over the long term provide greater resilience in housing delivery and contribute to improved infrastructure and local services. This approach will ensure that the Garden Village does not become a dormitory development. Further work on carbon impact and traffic impact will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Policy ST3 is well written and includes all aspirations appropriate to the delivery of a new garden community. As the site will have a significant and long frontage along its western boundary to the A1, the potential noise impacts and the impact of the existing pollution arising from the A1 on this new community should be justified with supporting studies. To enhance the sustainability of the Bassetlaw Garden Village the draft Local Plan is promoting a new station on the Lincoln to Sheffield Rail link and whilst a new station to support the proposed garden village is supported, its delivery may be problematic which may have impact on the sustainability of the Garden Village and the Apleyhead Junction. There is also concern regarding the accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists over the A1 / A57 junctions and to the nearest town (i.e. Worksop).	Policy ST3 requires an air quality assessment to be undertaken to ensure impacts of development are mitigated. It is acknowledged that a similar assessment for noise should also be required - Policy ST3 will be amended accordingly. Further work on traffic impact will need to be undertaken to support the development of a masterplan for the site. This will need to ensure that in the early stages of development if a railway station is not operational that the additional vehicle movements can be accommodated on the local and strategic road network. Policy ST3 requires new and improved pedestrian and cycle links to nearby facilities, Retford and across the A1 to the A57. However further work will need to be undertaken through a transport assessment to identify the requirements for each development phase.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	In our experience in preparing the Core Strategy, the Council was required to prepare extensive high-level documents; a Concept Framework with supporting studies to demonstrate the availability, suitability and likely economic viability of the proposed urban extension (Bassingthorpe Farm) was essential to demonstrate to the Inspector that both the Council and the landowners were supportive in bringing forward the site and that it was suitable and deliverable. A similar level of detail is likely to be required to support the identification of this new settlements within Bassetlaw, as Paragraph 72 of the NPPF refers.	Comments noted. The Local Plan recognises that a masterplan framework will be required to progress this site and to demonstrate that the site is suitable and deliverable.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the defined Main Towns of Bassetlaw are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions , which is considered to be a more sustainable option for development. Although we are supportive of the Local Plan’s ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the Garden Village as it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Bassetlaw does not suffer from overcrowding and key centres such as Retford are suitable for urban expansion and would benefit from further growth to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability as well as the vitality of surrounding rural settlements. Agree with paragraph 5.3.1 in terms of promoting a step change in economic growth, the delivery of a Garden Village and associated transport hub is not necessary nor suitable to facilitate that step change. Have significant concerns in relation to feasibility and viability of those proposals. The 2019 Landscape Study Bassetlaw already comprises a largely rural borough (98%) with a significant number of villages, particularly to the east. Do not support the creation of a new Garden Village, particularly when the Council is already seeking to locate a large portion of its housing distribution to the rural settlements rather than supporting its Main Towns. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. However, the Local Plan does not propose that infrastructure to be delivered within the plan period or demonstrate how that infrastructure will be delivered. Notwithstanding whether the above infrastructure is feasible, existing Main Towns already offer these facilities and services and would be better suited to deliver additional growth.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF270	Barton Willmore	<p>Retford is an established 'Main Town' with existing employment, shops, services and transport infrastructure to meet the day to day needs of residents. These infrastructure and facilities are not located in many of the rural settlements or the Garden Village, therefore, the Site at Retford is considered as a more sustainable location and should be supported for future growth. There is an overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes into the open countryside. The delivery of new homes through a Garden Village (with or without new transport links) is likely to generate additional car trips into the Main Towns such as Retford as residents will rely on its existing services and facilities. Paragraph 11.1.8 states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. This is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village has not been adequately considered and more sustainable option is represented by our Client's Site. The assessment of the feasibility and viability of the Garden Village appears to be limited to information contained within the 'Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment'. Have significant concerns as to the level of detail contained within the assessment. It takes a generic approach to all allocations in terms of costs, including abnormalities (assumes standard with no utilities diversions or anything), plus a non-specific approach to obligations that would have no relevance to a new settlement in a relatively isolated position and gives insufficient consideration to foul drainage, water, electricity, gas, off-site highway and other transport costs to ensure sustainability early on. Notwithstanding the weight being afforded to the delivery of a new railway station there appears to be no real certainty on how that station would be delivered or the costs of doing so. The Local Plan sets out that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2016 states the infrastructure requirements for the Garden Village can be "reasonably sought through on site provision and developer contributions" provided that the site is exempt from a CIL charge. Emphasise a lack of comprehensive consideration for the creation of a new Garden Settlement and the cost of associated infrastructure. Early indications suggest a cost of circa £2,000 a unit. Elsewhere in the country demonstrates that this significantly short of the reality of those costs. Costs could be somewhere in the region of 25 times this estimate. Additionally, there appears to have been no meaningful consideration given to how cashflow and funding of projects will be delivered as the development comes forward. The Council's 2020 Sustainability Appraisal states at paragraph 6.33 that rural areas tend to have more limited access to services and facilities and as a result will have minor negative effects on the SA objective 7 (transport), 10 (air quality) and 11 (climate change). This is largely due to rural areas being more car dependant. Other potential minor negative impacts highlighted within the SA are in relation to objective 7 (land and soils) and 12 (resource use and waste). Paragraph 6.42 highlights the Garden Village site is located within a Source Protection Zone and as such will likely have a significant negative impact on SA objective 8 (water by impact water and ground quality). Emphasise the sites location near potentially regionally significant archaeological remains and as such have a minor potential negative impact on SA objective 13 (cultural heritage). Not clear what the Local Plan's justification is for proposing such a substantial allocation of 216ha of greenfield land for the new Garden Village to support 4,000 new homes over its lifetime.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF271	Savills	<p>In supporting the Garden Village, both families see an opportunity to create a legacy for the community that they can be proud of. The families are united by a common belief that any development on their land must embrace the principles set out in the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and, in particular, SDGs 3, 11 and 13. To fulfil those goals, the Garden Village must: (i) be constructed in an environmentally considerate manner; (ii) achieve an ambitious increase in biodiversity in its locality; (iii) support an increase of physical activity levels; and (iv) facilitate low carbon living in the community. involvement in the proposals is underpinned by, and conditional on, fulfilment of these principles and Bassetlaw's commitment to the opportunity to create a truly sustainable and green section of the community. The Local Plan consultation has coincided with the publication of 'Living with Beauty' by the Government's 'Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission' (January 2020). The Commission and the Report highlight the importance of safeguarding beauty, community, history, landscape in our places. The overall aspiration of the Report is supported and in particular, the following comments go to the heart of what is anticipated for the Garden Village: "Many of the things that make settlements beautiful also make them healthy, happy and sustainable. A beautiful place is a place in which people wish to walk, rather than a place that the car helps them to avoid. It is a place in which they enjoy spending time with one another." [P11] The Report identifies three key approaches to improving places, which are in line with the land owners aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village: "Ask for Beauty: We do not see beauty as a cost, to be negotiated away once planning permission has been obtained. It is the benchmark that all new developments should meet. It includes everything that promotes a healthy and happy life, everything that makes a collection of buildings into a place, everything that turns anywhere into somewhere, and nowhere into home. So understood beauty should be an essential condition for the grant of planning permission." Refuse Ugliness: People do not only want beauty in their surroundings. They are repelled by ugliness, which is a social cost that everyone is forced to bear. Ugliness means buildings that are unadaptable, unhealthy and unsightly, and which violate the context in which they are placed. Such buildings destroy the sense of place, undermine the spirit of community, and ensure that we are not at home in our world. Promote Stewardship: Our built environment and our natural environment belong together. Both should be protected and enhanced for the long-term benefit of the communities that depend on them..... New developments should be regenerative, enhancing their environment and adding to the health, sustainability and biodiversity of their context. For too long now we have been exploiting and spoiling our country. The time has come to enhance and care for it instead. Our recommendations are designed to ensure that we pass on to future generations an inheritance at least as good as the one we have received." It is very important to the landowners that the Garden Village creates a legacy to be proud of, which delivers growth and health and well-being benefits for its residents and the wider community, but not at the expense of the environment.</p>	<p>Support for the Garden Village is noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with both landowners to ensure that the proposal for the Garden Village meets their aspirations for the environment, health, biodiversity and community leaving a positive legacy for future generations.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF271	Savills	<p>The opportunities presented by new settlements are addressed within paragraph 72 of the NPPF 2019. In general, support the aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village as set out in section 5.3 of the Draft Local Plan. In particular, paragraph 5.3.3 which states: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, shops and services. A new railway station and public transport hub will provide sustainable access to the wider area." The Garden City Principles set out in 5.3.7 and 5.3.8 are welcomed and supported. These principles are echoed in those within Chapter 4 of 'Living with Beauty' which identifies the following factors in creating beautiful places: • Townscape • Mixed Use • Affordability • Respect for heritage • Respect for nature • Respect for communities aspirations • Stewardship • Democracy The comments in 5.3.10 and 5.3.11 go to the heart of the landowners aspirations for the site. With specific reference to policy ST3, the landowners support the overarching policy objectives in principle at this stage as set out in A-D. In particular, the references to an 'environmentally-led' development in D. It is suggested that that given the focus on creating an innovative, green community, in order to meet the criteria set out in D 5. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, an early assessment of the current green infrastructure and its spatial inter-relationships should be made. This will enable the optimum planning of corridors between existing and new green areas around which building for houses and employment, with, of course, their own new green areas, can take place. The family is fully supportive of green space. However, they are concerned that the half hectare community woodland (less than half a football pitch) proposed for this plan period is inadequate for the footfall of the residents of the 750 houses also suggested for this plan period. The family look forward to a more substantial and realistic allocation through detailed masterplanning. Wherever possible, additional areas of green space, community woodland and useable open space should be sought and integrated into the design of the Garden Village. As the timescale for the delivery of the Garden Village extends into the future, the policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for changing technologies which could improve the sustainability of the site. The landowners consider that it is very important that the development facilitates an increase of physical activity and sport amongst its residents as a result of the economic, mental and physical health and well-being and environmental benefits that would be generated. The landowners consider that the World Health Organisation's Global Action Plan on Physical Activity together with the Sport England and local authority equivalent policy documents be consulted to guide development in this respect. Consideration should also be given to the creation of an overarching vision for the Garden Village which reflects the aspirations of the landowners and the Council for the site. The inclusion of land at Morton Hill Farm to create Bassetlaw Garden Village is supported in principle by our clients, The Mason Family, who are committed to working with The Girdham Family and the District Council to create a high quality, low carbon, landscape-led settlement for the future of Bassetlaw. There are likely to be many questions over the design, deliverability and developability of the site that need to be answered over 2020. The scheme is at the early stages but the family are committed to the principles and will contribute fully to further discussions about the delivery of this development.</p>	<p>Support for Policy ST3 is welcome. Further work on the existing green infrastructure network and its connectivity with other uses will need to be undertaken to ensure that the masterplan can be truly landscape led. Further work will be undertaken to determine the extent of appropriate tree coverage on the site, to ensure that provision is appropriate to mitigate the impacts of each phase of development. Flexibility will be built into the policy to ensure that as the development progresses the use of changing technologies can be incorporated into the design of development where appropriate. Healthy place-making is a key element of the Garden Village. The approach taken to creating an active place will be clarified in Policy ST3. Through collaborative working with the landowners and key stakeholders a vision and objectives for the Garden Village will be produced to reflect aspirations for the site.</p>
REF272	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	<p>Bassetlaw Garden Village in the area of Upper Morton indicates there will be further growth in this area beyond 2037 signalling further expansion which will have an impact on Retford and Villages Primary Care Network (PCN). Whilst service and infrastructure includes health facilities it is not specific what is meant by this. Community pharmacy provision is determined under pharmaceutical Regulations and would need an application to be successful. There will clearly be a need for this, so this expressed requirement will need to link into the Council's PNA. Dental facilities are commissioned by NHS England but it remains a dental business decision where to locate their premises. Similarly for optometry. Require ongoing consultation as this plan progresses so that we can support infrastructure development in line with expected need across the wide range of potential primary and community health and care services. Services and Infrastructure identifies: 'This significant new community will be large enough to sustain its own local shops and facilities. Policy ST3 requires a range of community facilities to help meet the day to day needs of its residents and which will have multiple benefits for the surrounding rural area. Sustainable access, including bus connectivity will ensure the existing and new communities are well-integrated, so all are able to benefit from a new Local Centre, health and education facilities and a community hub with associated sports facilities'.</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work with NHS Bassetlaw CCG to ensure the provision of primary and community health facilities meets the identified needs of the development.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF273	Anglian Water	<p>Anglian Water is generally supportive of the principles for the proposed garden village. 'Landscape, biodiversity and Green Infrastructure': Anglian Water is keen to promote 'Water smart communities' as part of the garden village. They use a more holistic and integrated approach to water management with the aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance liveability by contributing to green streetspaces and high quality open space • Promote the sustainable use of water resources and infrastructure to enable growth • Build resilience against the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events • Contribute to natural capital and biodiversity through multi functional water features • Deliver water efficient homes to reduce household bills and support affordability. <p>Policy ST45 of the Draft plan states that development should meet the optional higher water efficiency standard and water re-use measures should be included in development proposals wherever possible. There is no reference made to the garden village providing for water efficiency and re-use measures as part of the design principles. It is suggested that Policy ST3 be amended: '5. c) Housing standards to promote climate reliance in accordance with Policy ST45; c) d) An integrated approach to water management including water efficiency and re-use measures together with and surface water drainage and multifunctional greenspace which provides environmental and community benefits'</p>	<p>Support for the principle of the Garden Village is welcome. The principles of Water Smart Communities will be incorporated in Policy ST3 and the masterplan framework. The Local Plan should be read as a whole. So Policy ST45 applies to all new development including the garden village. However it is recognised that water re-use measures could be better referenced. Policy ST3 will be amended to ensure an integrated approach to water management is required at the garden village.</p>
1197023	Resident	<p>The concept of a garden village is not fully supported by the consultation.it is just a ' sound bite" to soften the terrible proposed over development in the area.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
REF275	Resident	<p>The new Bassetlaw Garden Village is a poorly conceived idea and will be of great detriment not only to the local vicinity but also the wider region. The approach lacks any consideration regarding its feasibility and viability. Disagree with the policy ST3. This policy should be removed in its entirety. It is our position that the main towns in Bassetlaw are capable of supporting the required additional growth. The development of a Garden Village would only serve to detriment these towns, and the district as a whole. The proposal of the plan is to facilitate a new settlement such as the Garden Village with a new railway station, road links and public transport hubs, however, the feasibility, deliverability and cost analysis have not been considered fully. The plan states that public funding for the transport infrastructure is likely to be limited but will be developer funded. It is of our opinion that this is an extremely unrealistic expectation. The timeline for these links to be completed is also imperative, as currently, they may not come to fruition for 20 years. Have a similar view with regards to services for the housing development, all of which would need to be run a considerable distance to reach the site. An appropriately positioned urban extension with these services and transport links already in the local vicinity present a far better alternative. Alternative transport (pedestrian and cycle routes), as well as bus routes, have been considered as part of the Garden Village. However, the proposed location means that very extensive infrastructure work will be required for such routes, with unknown usage given its proposed location. Considering the sustainable position of our client's land this is another unnecessary expense.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF276	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>A garden village built from scratch is going to be a hugely expensive enterprise. The new train station even with an infrastructure grant is unlikely to happen and the prospect of it being developer funded is pie in the sky. The only people who will benefit from this would be project are the landowners who stand to make a significant earner. A development of this scale would be better centred around the existing hubs of Retford or Worksop. Garden Villages on this scale are a gift to online traders, not sufficiently large enough to be self sustaining and will hence do nothing to arrest the continued decline of our towns that comes as a consequence of online shopping. Additional development around those towns is required to maintain, rejuvenate and grow the high streets and other associated facilities. There is already infrastructure around the two towns of Retford and Worksop, buses, trains and road network. A village of 700 lifting to 4,000 eventually, perhaps, is not of sufficient size to justify its own facilities, doctors, shops etc. Garden Village people will likely shop online and infrequently travel to Retford or Worksop by car. The regeneration of brownfield sites forms a key part of the Local Plan Vision and Objectives. Providing support to the comprehensive redevelopment of brownfield sites, particularly within town centres and at the former power station sites is a key Council Plan objective 14. The proposed site of the New Garden Village is alongside the A1 and will be subject to noise and pollution from that road. Whatever advances there are to be in battery technology and hydrogen fuelled cars it is unlikely that HGV vehicles will be cleaned up so as not to be a concern to GardenVillagers during the life of the project.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF277	Babworth Parish Council	<p>Policy ST3 should be removed from the Local Plan. Disagree that there is the need for a new Garden Village and advocate that the Main Towns are capable of accommodating additional growth through urban extensions, which is a more sustainable option for development. A new Garden Village, totalling some 4,000 homes, within Babworth Parish will immeasurably change the nature of the parish forever. It will become unrecognisable as the most rural and least densely-populated parish in the area, to the most urban parish with only Retford and Worksop having more Dwellings. Such a far-reaching, enormous, single concentration of development should not be “inflicted” on the Parish by building a “garden village” on 216 ha of the parish. It is more important than ever, that development in rural parishes is sustainable and maintains the character of that parish. Although we are supportive of the Local Plan’s ambition to establish sustainable development for the long-term needs of the District, object to the Garden Village as it will not provide for sustainable development and will undermine the sustainability of exiting Main Towns which serve the needs of the rural areas of the District. Agree with paragraph 5.3.1 in terms of promoting a step change in economic growth, the delivery of a Garden Village and associated transport hub is not necessary nor suitable to facilitate that step change. Concern in relation to the amount of evidence there is to understand how the development would come forward and how it would be likely to impact the residents of the parish. There is an overwhelming lack of evidence to support the feasibility and viability of the proposed sustainability features required to deliver the Garden Village which will not be delivered. Without those features, the Local Plan runs the very serious risk of simply allocating a large proportion of isolated homes in the open countryside. To support the new Garden Village, the Local Plan proposes a new railway station, road links and public transport hub to enable access to the wider settlements. However, the Local Plan does not propose that infrastructure to be delivered within the plan period or demonstrate how that infrastructure will be delivered. The delivery of new homes through a Garden Village (with or without new transport links) is likely to generate additional car trips into the Main Towns such as Retford as residents will rely on its existing services and facilities. Paragraph 11.1.8 states that public funding for transport infrastructure is likely to be limited and will be largely developer funded. This is not a realistic expectation. The financial viability of creating a new transport hub and train station alongside the Garden Village has not been adequately considered and more sustainable development option is represented by development at the main towns. While the development is taking place, in excess of 20 Years it is will cause massive congestion on the B6420 into Retford which is a very dangerous and congested road at peak times, with a level crossing, sharp corners, flooding areas and difficult junction at Babworth. Traffic noise and pollution will increase on the A1 and for the residents of Ranby Village. The Local Plan sets out that the Whole Plan Viability Assessment 2016 states the infrastructure requirements for the Garden Village can be “reasonably sought through on site provision and developer contributions” provided that the site is exempt from a CIL charge. A lack of comprehensive consideration for the creation of a new Garden Settlement and the cost of associated infrastructure. If the viability of the scheme changes part way through there may be a number of dwellings that are completely isolated and cut off from any other services adding to pollution and disruption. Not clear what the justification is for a substantial allocation of 216ha of greenfield land for the new Garden Village to support 4,000 new homes over its lifetime.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy.</p>
REF278	Fisher German	<p>The Garden Village is intended to make a significant contribution to achieving and meeting the housing requirement within the Plan period, equating to just over 8% of the total requirement. To ensure a sound Plan, the Council’s delivery assumptions for the site must be 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. In progressing the Garden Village allocation, it is considered that a robust review of the sites deliverability, including start dates, build out rates and having regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades, should be undertaken to ensure a sound allocation and Plan.</p>	<p>Further work will be undertaken to determine the type and level of infrastructure required to support the first phase of the Garden Village, and its timing.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF279	Resident	There will be huge disruption to the area whilst such an isolated large-scale development is being built on the greenfield site. The traffic problems will be enormous, whilst being built, and afterwards. There are infrastructure problems in your plan. The A1 traffic will be congested and further increased. Ranby village will again be detrimentally affected by the traffic on the A1 in terms of congestion (being able to join the A1), and also the noise and pollution. The A1 is already extremely noisy and an increase in traffic will only increase noise levels. It may become unbearable for us, and other residents to go outside, open windows, or be in certain rooms. By building on such a huge amount of greenfield acreage, the agricultural land is lost, there is less land to absorb the rainfall we experience (which may lead to flooding in other areas), and the environmental impact on the biodiversity is also detrimental. Read the proposals to "offset" this, with some open spaces and trees, but this is not comparable to the established habitats and biodiversity that will be destroyed. It cannot be replaced. This whole area is being developed at a fast pace in terms of industrial developments, and if this carries on, our district will no longer be very rural. The proposed residential developments within our parish will define our rural parish then as urban.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. This will include more information on transport impacts and the mitigation required to address those impacts.
REF281	Notts Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcome the inclusion of a new railway station at D.4.vii. It will however be important that this is developed as a priority and in advance of occupation of the new homes because it is much easier to motivate residents to use public transport when first moving to a new area than trying to change their travel behaviour from car to public transport when habits have already been established. Firm commitments and funding for the new station and new services will therefore have to be secured early on in the masterplanning process.	Further work will be undertaken in relation to the railway station delivery to inform future policy development.
1197063	Resident	By supporting the concept of this village, the Local Plan must recognise the significant impact it will have both directly and indirectly on small rural villages. It is inevitable and understandable that this village will attract young, working families offering affordable homes. Small rural areas attract developers for larger higher priced housing by their very nature as lack of amenities for families and travelling distance in rural areas are inevitable and go with the character of villages. Therefore a 20% increase in housing of this nature is unlikely to be required. This is not 'NIMBYism', it is social fact.	The Local Plan also supports appropriate rural growth. Neighbourhood Planning is an alternative but complementary way for the community to plan their areas and ensure the housing mix is appropriate to place.
REF282	National Trust	Support in principle the concept of creating a Garden Village – 'provided with a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, jobs and services...' although the subsequent policy may not do enough to support this aim. Support the principle of a comprehensive masterplan framework supported by a Consultative Group to guide future development. While the location may be acceptable, the proposed scale and spatial configuration of the proposed allocation, particularly in combination with proposed Policy SEM1, threaten to close the gap between Worksop and Retford creating urban sprawl from Worksop to the A1 and onwards to within 2.5km of Retford. Concerned about the proposed scale of the development, 'at least 4000 new homes over its lifetime', for which there is no clear rationale. The scale of development ought to be influenced by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development while following the green principles espoused; the need to retain Green Gaps and a distinct identity between the Garden Village and the towns of Worksop and Retford; and the housing and economic needs and markets of the district and sub-region. The policy ought to incorporate the explicit requirement of creating a net zero carbon development. The policy ought to incorporate the explicit requirement of delivering a net gain to biodiversity within the development. Part 5(d) commits to provision of 'at least 0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5 thereafter'. This represents less than 1% of the 216ha being promoted for development. We suggest that a much more aspirational figure is required and that this ought to be landscape/masterplan led, linking green infrastructure networks throughout the scheme with larger woodland areas on its margins. Likewise the proposed green infrastructure network comprising 5ha in the plan period and 5ha thereafter ought to be more aspirational (as a minimum the words 'at least' could be included) and that this figure ought to be landscape/urban design led. The proposed site is close to Clumber Park, which is managed by the National Trust, and the Trust supports the aspiration to create/improve cycling and pedestrian links as well as, ideally, a public transport connection.	The Garden Village was at an early stage in January 2020. As the Local Plan evolves the details will become clearer. The design will be landscape led with emphasis on healthy active places where people use public transport, walking and cycling to move around rather than the car for local journeys. Facilities will be located to enable this. A key theme of the Garden Village is delivering the green agenda. Support for energy efficiency, renewable and low carbon technologies is built in. Various other carbon offsetting measures including 30% tree canopy cover will help. 20% biodiversity net gain will be secured, higher than that in the emerging Environment Bill. 40% of the site will be set aside for green infrastructure a significant increase on that proposed originally.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF283	Resident	ST3.4 42 5.3.22 Agree with proposals to improve junctions at either end of B6420 Mansfield Road (Apleyhead and Babworth) but consider this road will also need elimination of the railway level crossing and the double bends near Morton to carry the increased traffic generated by the Garden Village and A57 capacity improvements: add to ST49.	Further work will be undertaken through the Transport Assessment for the site to determine the impacts on the level crossings. This would be required to be mitigated accordingly.
REF290	JVH Planning	Makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 750 homes in the Plan Period when the existing sustainable small rural villages are already showing a surplus over their projected requirement. New settlements are notoriously difficult to get started, infrastructure heavy and unreliable. They have only succeeded in areas of very high demand and have taken many years to deliver homes. A better strategy would be to increase the level of homes in the smaller settlements so that new permissions can be granted here, making best use of the existing social community and physical infrastructure in those settlements. There is no meaningful table in the Plan for each level of the settlement hierarchy showing the requirement, the commitments and what is left to be found. As the Plan stands it is a highly confusing document that does not convey to Plan users what is to be found where, which is the basic requirement of a Local Plan. Object to ST3 and the Garden Village and propose that the Plan be redrafted to • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy • Consider an alternative use of the Cottam Power Station Site. Identify new sites that are available in the villages of Rampton and Woodbeck to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF291 -	Resident	Significant concerns regarding the deliverability of the Garden Village. The policy identifies that a 'Consultative Group' of stakeholders and landholders is to be formed, with a masterplan and SPD for the overall site to be prepared. Whilst not specified in any of the supporting evidence, it is understood that the site is in multiple private landownerships at this time and that the proposals are in their infancy. Supporting text details the extensive infrastructure requirements necessary to deliver the overall scheme, including a new railway station, new access roads and a new public transport hub (these are detailed further in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2020). Query whether these costs have been considered fully as part of the viability work supporting the draft Plan. The Bassetlaw Interim Whole Plan & CIL Viability Assessment (August 2018) appears to take a general approach to development across the draft Plan, rather than looking at the very specific and significant costs and cash flow issues for a new settlement. It states that the approach to abnormal construction costs (including utilities diversions) is "based on generic tests" and then assumes a generic cost of mitigation of £2,000 per dwelling that are "based on historic evidence of planning obligation contributions over the last five years (excluding Affordable Housing which is factored in separately) the following cost allowances have been adopted in the study" (page 30). This is substantially short of the real costs of delivering a development of this scale in this location. The Aecom January 2018 publication 'Garden towns and villages cost model' suggests that a new garden village in 5,000 residential units on a 350 hectare greenfield site in the South East of England would have construction costs of £53,568 per unit. The very high cost of strategic infrastructure and the impacts on cash flow (which isn't mentioned in the Council's evidence), needs to be considered in detail to demonstrate deliverability. A new railway station is proposed, but this is only safeguarded and is not expected to come forward until after 2037. No costs are attributed to this as it is outside of the Plan period. Query who will be paying for this and how will it be secured – is there any certainty of deliverability? The interim solution appears to be a bus subsidy, which as set out in the IDP, is estimated to cost around £590/dwelling (paragraph 3.2.12). This cost appears broadly reasonable, but further detail is required to understand what money needs to be paid upfront to secure the service, and the implications this would have on cashflow. There is no detail on what this bus service may look like – is it a conventional bus on non-segregated roads? How regular would it be? The attractiveness of this service is critical to encouraging modal shift for the occupants in this relatively isolated new settlement before 2037. This is fundamental to the success of the allocation. This is supported by the Inspector's initial findings into the Uttlesford Local Plan (10th January 2020), where in relation to a proposed garden	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
		<p>settlement it was concluded that: "44. Whilst appreciating the difficulties in providing a full RTS service from the outset and recognising the role of incremental improvements, in our view, the lack of a RTS until towards the end of the plan period would mean the modal shifts anticipated would not be realised. Moreover, the use of less sustainable modes of travel could have become engrained in the habits of residents living in the homes built within the early phases of the Garden Communities. According to the latest trajectory in ED51 this would be well in excess of 1000 homes.... 46. This being so, there is a danger that the Garden Communities would be served by little more than a conventional, regularly running bus service for a good number of years. This would use the existing road network, which is at times congested and there are concerns that such a bus service would be no quicker, and potentially slower, than travelling by car. It is also unclear to what degree the buses would run on existing roads as opposed to segregated bus lanes or busways and how the latter would be phased in. 47. Buses running on existing unsegregated carriageways, even based on a 10 or 15 minute service, is unlikely to encourage the residents to use their cars less for local journeys, despite this being better than the services that operate in Uttlesford at present. Consider this would be directly at odds with Garden Community Principle 7 which requires integrated and accessible transport systems, with walking, cycling and public transport designed to be the most attractive forms of local transport." These initial findings are appended to this letter as they are highly relevant for the preparation and soundness of a Local Plan that proposes a new settlement. The ongoing Examination into the North Essex Garden Communities is also relevant, particularly in relation to a deliverable sustainable transport approach. In determining the trajectory for the site, it is considered to be inappropriate to draw direct comparisons between the Garden Village proposal and other large schemes in the District (namely the Harworth Colliery site) which appear to be very different in both scale and site-specific circumstances. The latter site is in single ownership (Harworth Estates) and provides 1,000 dwellings overall (which may increase to 1,300 dwellings) with lesser infrastructure requirements. The Garden Village represents a significantly larger scale scheme with multiple landowners, and it is not clear what formal partnership or agreements are in place. There are also significant infrastructure requirements for the site overall, and there do not appear to be any phasing plans to indicate at what point different items of infrastructure will be required to enable the envisaged development trajectory. There is limited evidence related to deliverability which justifies the trajectory for the Garden Village. This means that this element of the anticipated supply for within the plan period should also be treated with caution. Suggested change: 1. Address the significant concerns in relation to the proposed Garden Village. Further detail is required to demonstrate that it is deliverable and that it can contribute 750 dwellings within the Plan period in a sustainable manner in line with the Garden Community Principles.</p>	
REF292	JVH Planning	<p>Makes no sense to be allocating a Garden Village in the rural area to deliver 750 homes in the Plan Period when the existing sustainable small rural villages are already showing a surplus over their projected requirement. New settlements are notoriously difficult to get started, infrastructure heavy and unreliable. They have only succeeded in areas of very high demand and have taken many years to deliver homes. A better strategy would be to increase the level of homes in the smaller settlements so that new permissions can be granted here, making best use of the existing social community and physical infrastructure in those settlements. There is no meaningful table in the Plan for each level of the settlement hierarchy showing the requirement, the commitments and what is left to be found. As the Plan stands it is a highly confusing document that does not convey to Plan users what is to be found where, which is the basic requirement of a Local Plan. It is proposed that the Plan be redrafted to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Omit the two new settlements Cottam and Garden Village • Redistribute the numbers anticipated in the Plan period to the existing settlement hierarchy especially to the smaller rural villages to allow them to grow organically and make the best use of the existing infrastructure and make allocations in the villages to achieve this strategy • Consider an alternative use of the Cottam Power Station Site. Identify new sites that are available in the village of Sutton cum Lound to support a larger allocation to the small rural settlements the following sites are available for development. 	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1197091	William Davis	The role that new settlements can provide is acknowledged in the NPPF (paragraph 72). The delivery of new settlements can be challenging and reliance on this site to deliver 750 dwellings from 2027 onwards may be optimistic. Evidence regarding the deliverability of the site is also unclear and the proposal is therefore not justified nor potentially effective and in breach of the tests of soundness. While the New Settlements Addendum demonstrates the suitability of the site in terms of the SA, it does not demonstrate the deliverability of the site during the plan period with a reliance on evidence from Harworth Colliery (a site adjacent to an existing settlement); evidence on land ownership, developer interest, the involvement of Nottinghamshire County Council from a transport perspective (especially important given the new railway station and park & ride) does not appear to be available at present. To prevent an over reliance on delivery from the site and be consistent with national policy (specifically paragraphs 59 of the NPPF regarding the need to significantly (our emphasis) boost the supply of housing and 73 on developability) additional housing allocations should be made to provide a sufficient buffer and ensure that the housing requirement is met.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF293 -	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	To ensure this vision is realised the Garden Village should be developed to the following nationally identified Garden City principles: "generous, accessible, and good quality green and blue infrastructure that promotes health, wellbeing, and quality of life, and promotes opportunities to deliver environmental and biodiversity net gain and enhancements to natural capital." and 'Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland'. Given that BDC have to meet significant housing targets, then a BDC led, sustainable development with ambitious habitat creation targets is a bold vision that we are supportive of in principle. Fully understand the need for sustainable development to support economic growth and jobs. It is essential that wildlife is safeguarded during this process if we do not wish to see an impoverished environment. The aim should be to achieve a win-win situation for wildlife and the economy. Not against all development. Work with developers within the county to ensure opportunities are taken to benefit wildlife and create truly sustainable development. Planning must focus on adaptation to protect, restore and create a robust and resilient natural environment which can stand up to the challenges of climate change. The uncertainties of a changing climate are just as relevant for people as they are for wildlife. Well connected, landscape-scale areas for wildlife are good for our mental and physical well-being and the economy. The added benefits of creating, or restoring, wildlife habitats include flood control, pollution control to food production and long-term solutions to climate change impacts. NWT are strong advocates of the need for access to high-quality wildlife-rich open space for the residents of the Garden Village. Note that the proposal includes the retention, enhancement and integration of important hedgerows, woodland and trees on site, an integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional greenspace and the provision of at least 0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5ha thereafter. In addition, a multifunctional green infrastructure network comprising 5ha in this plan period, and 5ha thereafter, that connects to the existing, to incorporate publicly accessible open space to meet the standards set out in Policy ST41 is also proposed. Welcome the intention to protect existing habitats and create new woodland and multifunctional greenspace. Proposals should provide targeted and significant Green Infrastructure that maximises biodiversity opportunities and protects and enhances existing ecological features such as wildlife corridors that link to the countryside beyond the site. The creation and enhancement of GI through development must contribute to Biodiversity Action Plans to halt and reverse the decline in priority habitats and species. No Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) or water courses are within the proposed location of the Garden Village which consists largely of intensively managed arable fields. There are boundary hedgerows, which will have some wildlife value. Arable field margins are Habitats of 'principal importance' in England and so every effort should be made to retain and enhance them through the new development. The UK BAP lists of priority species and habitats remain, however, important and valuable reference sources. Notably, they have been used to help draw up statutory lists of priority species and habitats in England, (see NI species and NI habitats lists), as required under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (England). Further information provided about UK BAP priority species and habitats. Local	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. This includes for green infrastructure both the amount and mix of uses within the network.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden	Village	<p>authorities in England and Wales have a key role to play in the conservation of biodiversity and this is now recognised and formalised within Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006, where: "Every public body must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity" The location of the Garden Village is likely to be a less damaging option to wildlife when compared, for example, with development of the former Bevercotes Colliery Local Wildlife Site which had been considered previously. Note that the development will be guided by the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan framework facilitated by a Consultative Group. Facilitated by the Council this key delivery mechanism will ensure stakeholder and community buy-in from the outset. Keen to be involved in a project group in order to help shape the plan for the site. The masterplan should be supported by a full Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) so that protected species are properly considered in the planning process and to allow the local planning authority to be in possession of all relevant ecological information when developing the masterplan. The EclA will need to be periodically updated due to the phasing of the scheme. Refer to Practical Guides for Creating Successful New Communities Guide 7: Planning for Green and Prosperous Places, TCPA. Living Draft, January 2018. It is stated that Bassetlaw Garden Village will promote a step-change towards active and public transport through a highly legible, attractive and accessible movement network, including a new railway station and integrated public transport hub and will seek to improve opportunities for cycling and pedestrian links between the Garden Village, the surrounding communities, in particular Retford, and over the A1 to natural and heritage assets such as Clumber Park. Hope that our Idle Valley Nature Reserve will become a key destination through the cycle network.</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF299	Gladmans	<p>Policy ST3 details the Council will support the delivery of a new Garden Village on 216ha of land adjacent to the A1/A57 Apleyhead Junction. The Framework is clear that local plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change⁹. In this regard it is essential therefore that the expected supply from the Garden Village over the plan period is based on realistic assumptions on lead-in times and delivery rates. It is important that clear evidence is provided to demonstrate that any assumptions that are made within the housing trajectory are demonstrably realistic at this stage, accurately reflecting the challenges associated with the delivery of such sites and their current planning status. This evidence should include Statements of Common Ground between interested parties and appropriate sense checking should also be undertaken against local, regional and national evidence (for example, the information on lead in times and delivery rates from sites contained within Reports such as Lichfields 'Start to Finish' Report; and, Savills Spotlight: Planning and Housing Delivery Report, May 2019). The potential for further slippage from such a scheme will necessitate a flexible approach within the Local Plan's policies to ensure that they are responsive to rapid change and that development needs can be met in full over the plan period. Given the strategic scale and specific nature of the proposal it will be vitally important for the Local Plan to provide a clear contingency against its overall requirement to take into account the fact that such proposals will invariably deliver at a slower rate than originally envisaged when a Local Plan is examined. This can be achieved by including policies that take a responsive and flexible approach to sustainable development at the edge of suitable settlements to ensure that a positive response can be taken where monitoring indicates that the expected delivery from the proposed Garden Village has slipped (see comments on Policy ST2 above). Paragraphs 5.1.34 to 5.1.36 of the Plan summarise the process undertaken through the preparation of the Local Plan to date which has led to the identification of land adjacent to Apleyhead Junction as the preferred location for a Garden Village. As the Council are aware, land at Bevercotes Colliery was previously considered alongside Gamston Airfield as the location for the Garden Village for Bassetlaw. Gladman maintain that Bevercotes Colliery is fully capable of being delivered through the plan as a standalone Priority Regeneration Area. The identification of Bevercotes Colliery as a Priority Regeneration Area will provide further assurance that the long-term housing and employment needs will be delivered during and after the plan period. As outlined in section 6, Bevercotes Colliery can be bought forwards in a manner that positively responds to the local landscape and biodiversity, whilst respecting the existing communities and contributing to the local economy.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>Natural England recognises the intention of the proposed garden village to follow the nationally identified garden city principles. Welcome the laudable aims to create a sustainable community with green infrastructure at the heart of the project and the creation of wildlife friendly space between Worksop and Retford. Strong reservations with the location of the village in such close proximity to Clumber Park, part of which is nationally designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The impact of locating a new settlement of up to 4,000 new homes does not appear to have been satisfactorily considered within the local plan documents. Clumber Park covers an area of 1,531ha with the SSSI covering 526ha. The park comprises one of the largest expanses of semi-natural vegetation in Nottinghamshire. It is made up of relict ancient woodland, historic parkland and extensive grass heath with rich invertebrate, bird and bat communities. The origins of the site can be traced back to the Royal Forest of Sherwood. Additional interest is provided by conifer woodland and open water. The SSSI was re-notified and extended in May 1999. Clumber Park SSSI is located 950 metres from the proposed garden village and our main concerns are that the close proximity of an additional large population will increase visitor pressure and reduce air quality on this site which will potentially damage the fragile habitats and species that the SSSI designation protects. Visitor Pressure - Whilst the plan admirably promotes (5.3.2) the use of new cycling and pedestrian links from the garden village to Clumber Park, this facilitation of visitors to the site will increase the pressures detailed below. The intended hope that residents will use the links which will reduce reliance on car transport to the site cannot be relied upon and an increase in vehicle traffic is probable. The SSSI is notified for a number of sensitive habitats and species and a substantial increase in visitor numbers is likely to result in a detrimental effect on these features;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Increase in compaction to soils and vegetation particularly of the lowland heathland, acid grassland and woodlands. · Increase in disturbance to ground flora vegetation · Increase in disturbance to breeding bird assemblages of the woodlands and open water · Increase in disturbance to ground nesting birds (woodlark and nightjar) considered to be of European importance identified within the boundary of the Sherwood Forest possible potential Special Protection Area (ppSPA). <p>Air Quality - Air quality impacts from car use as well as from the residential and employment /industrial development opportunities will see a change to the current situation, and possibly have a detrimental effect on the sensitive habitats of the SSSI, particularly lowland heathland and acid grassland. Air quality impacts on invertebrates, which Clumber Park is also notified for are not yet fully understood. In addition Apleyhead Junction Site SEM1 is immediately adjacent to Clumber Park. It will have pedestrian and cycle routes linked to the Garden Village to provide employment via sustainable transport. However, due to the proximity and the unpredictable behaviour of the residents who may work here or others commuting in, an increase in traffic to this location will likely result in reductions in air quality and associated impacts on the SSSI notified features. Welcome the provision within the Garden Village of green corridors linked to community woodland which would contribute towards the Sherwood Re-forestation project, however there is no detail about this Project or links to references. At point 5d of the policy wording we note the provision of at least "0.5ha for community woodland in this plan period and land identified for 1.5ha thereafter", whilst this is welcome we are concerned that this may be inadequate given the pressure from users. We would wish to ensure that tree planting creates a biodiverse area of woodland and not a token area of trees.</p>	<p>The potential impact of the Garden Village upon Clumber Park SSSI and the Birklands and Bilhaugh SPA will be assessed through a Recreational impact Assessment. This will be undertaken in partnership with Natural England.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF304	Pegasus	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 52) acknowledges that; ...the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follow the principles of Garden Cities. Working with the support of their communities local planning authorities should consider whether such opportunities provide the best way achieving sustainable development". The Local Plan seeks to allocate the Bassetlaw Garden Village a site of 216ha as an area of long-term sustainable growth. It is suggested that this Garden Village could deliver up to 4,000 dwellings over its lifetime with a target delivery of 750 dwellings over the plan period. The recent Uttlesford Local Plan Stage 1 Inspectors Report highlights the problems which can be associated with a reliance upon such sites without clear and robust delivery evidence. In the case of Uttlesford three Garden Communities were proposed. The Inspector acknowledged that the Garden Communities would be responsible for the delivery of a large amount of the housing requirement. In considering the Garden Communities the Inspector identified they would not deliver the quantum of housing in the plan period that the Council's trajectory was showing. The Inspector was concerned about the lack of evidence to enable a conclusion to be made that the proposed allocations were sound and that they would deliver sufficient levels of housing over the plan period. In relation to the Bassetlaw Garden Village it is identified by the Local Planning Authority that: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland ..." It is acknowledged that several alternatives were reviewed. Whilst it is concluded that this location has been identified as being more suitable, it is not without its constraints. Furthermore, it appears that the Council has been 'wedded' to the delivery of a Garden Village or Garden Villages without consideration of suitable alternatives, including additional sites within the Main Towns, including Retford. 3.7 In addition, notwithstanding our concerns regarding the assessment of alternatives to a Garden Village, there is significant scope for a slippage in the timetable. Prior to development commencing, post BLP adoption, a significant amount of work is required to overcome the identified constraints, develop the identified required masterplan and appropriate infrastructure. It is, therefore, probable that the timescale identified for delivery could slip leading to an under-delivery in the plan period for this site. Any slippage in the delivery of this key site will have a significant impact upon the identified buffer (see section 4 below). If appropriate the Bassetlaw Garden Village proposal must be founded upon clear and robust evidence together with a realistic delivery timetable. It is on these grounds that our client has significant concerns with the Garden Village.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF307	Savills	<p>In supporting the Garden Village, both families see an opportunity to create a legacy for the community that they can be proud of. The families are united by a common belief that any development on their land must embrace the principles set out in the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and, in particular, SDGs 3, 11 and 13. To fulfil those goals, the Garden Village must: (i) be constructed in an environmentally considerate manner; (ii) achieve an ambitious increase in biodiversity in its locality; (iii) support an increase of physical activity levels; and (iv) facilitate low carbon living in the community. involvement in the proposals is underpinned by, and conditional on, fulfilment of these principles and Bassetlaw's commitment to the opportunity to create a truly sustainable and green section of the community. The Local Plan consultation has coincided with the publication of 'Living with Beauty' by the Government's 'Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission' (January 2020). The Commission and the Report highlight the importance of safeguarding beauty, community, history, landscape in our places. The overall aspiration of the Report is supported and in particular, the following comments go to the heart of what is anticipated for the Garden Village: "Many of the things that make settlements beautiful also make them healthy, happy and sustainable. A beautiful place is a place in which people wish to walk, rather than a place that the car helps them to avoid. It is a place in which they enjoy spending time with one another." [P11] The Report identifies three key approaches to improving places, which are in line with the land owners aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village: "Ask for Beauty: We do not see beauty as a cost, to be negotiated away once planning permission has been obtained. It is the benchmark that all new developments should meet. It includes everything that promotes a healthy and happy life, everything that makes a collection of buildings into a place, everything that turns anywhere into somewhere, and nowhere into home. So understood beauty should be an essential condition for the grant of planning permission." Refuse Ugliness: People do not only want beauty in their surroundings. They are repelled by ugliness, which is a social cost that everyone is forced to bear. Ugliness means buildings that are unadaptable, unhealthy and unsightly, and which violate the context in which they are placed. Such buildings destroy the sense of place, undermine the spirit of community, and ensure that we are not at home in our world. Promote Stewardship: Our built environment and our natural environment belong together. Both should be protected and enhanced for the long-term benefit of the communities that depend on them..... New developments should be regenerative, enhancing their environment and adding to the health, sustainability and biodiversity of their context. For too long now we have been exploiting and spoiling our country. The time has come to enhance and care for it instead. Our recommendations are designed to ensure that we pass on to future generations an inheritance at least as good as the one we have received." It is very important to the landowners that the Garden Village creates a legacy to be proud of, which delivers growth and health and well-being benefits for its residents and the wider community, but not at the expense of the environment.</p>	<p>Support for the Garden Village is noted and welcome. The Council will continue to work in partnership with both landowners to ensure that the proposal for the Garden Village meets their aspirations for the environment, health, biodiversity and community leaving a positive legacy for future generations.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF307	Savills	<p>The opportunities presented by new settlements are addressed within paragraph 72 of the NPPF 2019. In general, support the aspirations for Bassetlaw Garden Village as set out in section 5.3 of the Draft Local Plan. In particular, paragraph 5.3.3 which states: "Development will be provided within a high quality, highly biodiverse landscape, dominated by green infrastructure and community woodland, where residents and employees can easily move by sustainable transport to new community facilities, shops and services. A new railway station and public transport hub will provide sustainable access to the wider area." The Garden City Principles set out in 5.3.7 and 5.3.8 are welcomed and supported. These principles are echoed in those within Chapter 4 of 'Living with Beauty' which identifies the following factors in creating beautiful places: • Townscape • Mixed Use • Affordability • Respect for heritage • Respect for nature • Respect for communities aspirations • Stewardship • Democracy The comments in 5.3.10 and 5.3.11 go to the heart of the landowners aspirations for the site. With specific reference to policy ST3, the landowners support the overarching policy objectives in principle at this stage as set out in A-D. In particular, the references to an 'environmentally-led' development in D. It is suggested that that given the focus on creating an innovative, green community, in order to meet the criteria set out in D 5. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, an early assessment of the current green infrastructure and its spatial inter-relationships should be made. This will enable the optimum planning of corridors between existing and new green areas around which building for houses and employment, with, of course, their own new green areas, can take place. The family is fully supportive of green space. However, they are concerned that the half hectare community woodland (less than half a football pitch) proposed for this plan period is inadequate for the footfall of the residents of the 750 houses also suggested for this plan period. The family look forward to a more substantial and realistic allocation through detailed masterplanning. Wherever possible, additional areas of green space, community woodland and useable open space should be sought and integrated into the design of the Garden Village. As the timescale for the delivery of the Garden Village extends into the future, the policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for changing technologies which could improve the sustainability of the site. The landowners consider that it is very important that the development facilitates an increase of physical activity and sport amongst its residents as a result of the economic, mental and physical health and well-being and environmental benefits that would be generated. The landowners consider that the World Health Organisation's Global Action Plan on Physical Activity together with the Sport England and local authority equivalent policy documents be consulted to guide development in this respect. Consideration should also be given to the creation of an overarching vision for the Garden Village which reflects the aspirations of the landowners and the Council for the site. The inclusion of land at Morton Hill Farm to create Bassetlaw Garden Village is supported in principle by our clients, The Mason Family, who are committed to working with The Girdham Family and the District Council to create a high quality, low carbon, landscape-led settlement for the future of Bassetlaw. There are likely to be many questions over the design, deliverability and developability of the site that need to be answered over 2020. The scheme is at the early stages but the family are committed to the principles and will contribute fully to further discussions about the delivery of this development.</p>	<p>Support for Policy ST3 is welcome. Further work on the existing green infrastructure network and its connectivity with other uses will need to be undertaken to ensure that the masterplan can be truly landscape led. Further work will be undertaken to determine the extent of appropriate tree coverage on the site, to ensure that provision is appropriate to mitigate the impacts of each phase of development. Flexibility will be built into the policy to ensure that as the development progresses the use of changing technologies can be incorporated into the design of development where appropriate. Healthy place-making is a key element of the Garden Village. The approach taken to creating an active place will be clarified in Policy ST3. Through collaborative working with the landowners and key stakeholders a vision and objectives for the Garden Village will be produced to reflect aspirations for the site.</p>
1197234	Resident	<p>Support the development of site at Upper Morton. Neighbourhood Plans have successfully indicated where suitable small scale and in fill housing development can take place across Bassetlaw. In addition, the Green Garden Village proposed at Upper Morton will provide enough housing for the needs of Bassetlaw Residents. The greenest solution for housing is looking at existing buildings and seeing what can be converted to housing use and brought up to a green eco standard. I also believe housing should be closer to places of work, which Cottam site proposed housing certainly isn't. Yes, there is scope for housing and regeneration within Worksop and the proposed Garden Village at Upper Morton will enable residents of Worksop and places near Retford to live in a green environment and access the community and also places of employment.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcome.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
1197243	Resident	The Proposed railway station will encourage additional parking by the commuters from out of town who have traditionally travelled to Retford or Worksop to catch their trains. How many of the affordable homes proposed will be allocated Housing association / council house dwellings? How many of the sheltered accommodation units for older people proposed will be allocated to Basset Law Housing association / council house dwellings? What does the appropriate contributions towards primary and secondary schools entail, will these schools be definitely be built. The build up of traffic to the schools in Retford will bottleneck at the junction of the B6420 and the A620 road junction. Will the appropriate contributions towards health care facilities guarantee that there will be sufficient medical facilities on the Garden Village site? Can Bassetlaw / Worksop hospital cope with the additional volume of patients? The build up of traffic at the A620 & B6420 junction due to the local school start and end times is horrendous. What does the proposed contribution improvement plans entail to ensure that the traffic there flows smoothly going forward?	At least 20% of homes will be affordable. 10% will be for rent. 20% of the homes will be for older people. In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. Further detailed bespoke work will be undertaken to demonstrate viability.
1197261	Resident	Do not support the concept of a Garden Village. Again, services including healthcare, social care and education should be in place before building. Bassetlaw Hospital will be inadequate to cover the needs of the proposed developments	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan.
1197263	Resident	The development of the Garden Village states that it will introduce 4000 new properties, this is a huge number of houses, and will mean a huge number of residents. If the Garden Village is introduced, this is more countryside and green space which will be lost. The plan also talks about the introduction of a railway station. I assume this will be on the existing Leeds-Lincoln line? I use this line every day to commute between Retford and Sheffield. My journey already takes 45 minutes. The introduction of another station on this line will significantly add to my journey time.	The rail feasibility study shows that an additional station can be accommodated in service delivery on the Lincoln-Sheffield line.
REF326	Resident	Object to the proposed Garden Village. The council has included us (our home and plot of land) in the proposed Garden Village without obtaining our permission to do so. This came to light late yesterday evening at the very last minute consultation held at Ranby Village Hall. Have not offered our land to the Council for the proposed Garden Village. This is privately owned land that is, I repeat, NOT for the council's disposal. We will be located in the middle of the proposed Garden Village. Our water supply comes through the farm where this proposal is. How is the council going to guarantee our water supply? You cannot deprive a family of their basic drinking water and kill us by dehydration. This will have a direct impact on our amenities and the council needs to think carefully before proceeding with this plan. How is the council going to protect our privacy? Currently live in the country, and are not overlooked. Our amenities will again be affected by surrounding us with 4000 houses. The traffic created by 4000 houses will create excessive noise pollution for us. What steps are the council going to take to protect us from this? The neighbourhood's character will be altered, currently being countryside and view from the B6420 will be altered. This will have an impact on the neighbourhood's amenities once again.	The site is in the ownership of two landowners and excludes the land referred to. Existing services that cross the site will be maintained and secured through a legal agreement. Careful design will ensure that amenity is maintained. A Transport Assessment will identify impacts from the development on the road network and identify measures to address those impacts.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF330	Resident	<p>I am a child living where you are planning to put 4000 houses I do not like this for multiple reasons. My first point that by building more houses here you are destroying the green fields. I do hope you are aware about global warming. But by doing this (building 4000 houses) you are just simply increasing a few problems. 1. you are shorting earth's life, 2. less lives will be able to live - this one I am not too sure on but I am pretty certain that this could happen if you kill out living things. Now I know you are probably thinking that people in the future could do this too and I won't be there to stop this so why am I trying to stop you now. I am doing this for certain reasons: 1. to help the future 2. YOU ARE DESTROYING THE BEAUTIFUL EARTH AND CREATION. The earth isn't here for us to build on and kill nature. No! we came in the process of it's making so if you ask me, we are simply destroying what made us. I don't know about you but that sounds crazy. You are doing it, not me. You are an adult you should know better than me a child. But because you are destroying the countryside with putting 4000 houses here I will have to live in this destroyed world. Please think about where you put houses and stop picking on countryside just because it is easy for you and you don't need to think too hard. My next point sort of carries on from the last. It is about wildlife. Wildlife the creatures, the animals, the cute, the ugly, the young, the old it comes in all sorts of shapes and sizes. Many people don't like animals or creatures (can't blame the ones scared of them I can't say much to that. I am scared of spiders myself. I don't kill them if it is not necessary I release them back into the wildlife. Back to the point).But we can't and shouldn't really kill them, they were here first, we evolved from them. We can ignore them but if you go building 4000 houses around here, you are not going to knock the farmer out of his home, you are going to knock tonnes of wildlife out of homes - they come in all different shapes and sizes from huge birds of prey and foxes to the tiny mice and rats. We have also had grass snake which are protected in our garden who rely on the mice population in the fields to survive and so do the buzzard. We have swallows which are protected and heron and stoat all sorts. Now here's a different view of the problem let's put it this way. Think of baby bunnies being born. 7 years time you have decided to build those amount of number of houses in the countryside. You get to the bit where those little bunnies were born now living. Now imagine that you had lived in one house for most of your life you will have started to have grown to loving this house then without no warning a load of builders come and you have to leave the house you now love - gone and destroyed. You narrowly missing death too, nowhere to live and bring your babies up. You get the image let's move on. Now another reason I don't like this is I love playing in the fields and the byway when it has been raining. This is another point if you build 4000 houses here you will have to make sure that we are not flooded – how will you guarantee to keep me and my family safe from being flooded by building 4000 houses here? My dog also won't be pleased for she loves walking down the byway and getting mucky so do I. You are destroying green fields and happy lives homes (not the homes you are making, the animals homes). Also by doing this you are kinda going against the world of your own. A lot of us are trying to stop polluting the world but by doing all this building in the clean countryside you are polluting the world and no doubt about this. If you build the houses the people living in them will possibly litter and we don't want litter in the country, we are trying to prevent it. Let's move on.</p> <p>I will have to live the rest of my life in this destructed world that you are making in my countryside. Then my children will have to live in it too. It is not pleasant unless you are used to it but I am now a country child. Living in the country is better than living in a town. Never have I got ill since I came to live here, I have been here since I turned 3. I love this place and plead that you stop building on this beautiful open green countryside where I am growing up in. When I got told I was horrified, it is terrible if you knew what it was like you would definitely feel the same way.</p>	<p>The Local Plan uses brownfield land where possible but unfortunately there is not enough to meet housing growth. The environment will be protected and enhanced through development. This will be through ecological assessments for the site.</p>
1197282	Resident	<p>Vehemently do NOT support this policy as it will create many problems of traffic own the B6420 and other issues in a rural area. The Consultation Period should be extended. We lived at Barn Cottage for 24 years and this Policy is totally unwelcome.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will identify impacts from the development on the road network and identify measures to address those impacts.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF333 -	Resident	<p>Despite the requirement to scrub 2 x proposed Garden Villages following the previous consultation, the LPA clings on to the vanity-project-ideal, with an entirely new location. Representing wasted work/local authority resource, considering that the LAA has already identified sufficient land for all housing needs in the district. The retention of the Garden Village ideal is all the more confusing when according to 5.1.8 of the subject consultation:yet the “Functional Cluster Model” is dead. The 2020 Draft Bassetlaw LP has returned to a settlement hierarchy model. Whom will the Apleyhead Garden Village be serving? Ranby?? Another example of how the total reliance on N2D2, has led to this intervention/location. Settlements for whom N2D2 is not relevant (as identified by GL Hearn), are being sacrificed. All previous comments made in connection with the Garden Village proposal apply. That the LPA is upping housing targets intended as regeneration assistance, to prop up a Garden Village, is entirely counter intuitive and fails to deliver Sustainable Development. This submission OBJECTS to Garden Village delivery and to POLICY ST49 (2,3,4). Alongside acknowledgement that electric cars will be instrumental in delivering sustainable transport solutions both during but especially after, the lifetime of the proposed LP, monies allocated to public transport for the Garden Village, should be used to enhance services in existing villages.</p>	<p>The housing targets in the Local Plan are necessary to be consistent with national policy. Unfortunately there is not enough land available to meet housing needs. The Garden Village helps meet those targets. The Local plan and Neighbourhood Planning support appropriate growth in rural villages proportionate to its place.</p>
REF335 -	Resident	<p>Do not agree with building on the colossal 533 acres of green fields for a “garden village”. I think to call it that is a misnomer. It would not be a village, and by the nature of where it was built, it would not be a “garden”. It will destroy more precious greenfields and countryside, not to mention all the flora and fauna that will be lost. The roads into and around Retford will be clogged up with traffic, as all those residents have to commute everywhere. It will be the same situation with congestion while it is being built, and the A1 will be affected terribly. Don’t believe the “train station” plan will come off, and there are 2 stations within close proximity already. I also think that building a separate new town, like to garden village will actually destroy Retford and Worksop, as people will not necessarily visit those town centres. Houses should be built closer to the towns, to support them. The garden village is not sustainable.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF336	Resident	<p>The location of this proposal is absolutely unacceptable as it is going to destroy 216 hectares of Greenfield site still being actively farmed. As a result of this proposal farmers will loose their livelihood and home. The local green landscape will be completely destroyed and replaced with housing and industrial estate. This will affect the local's amenities to enjoy the pleasure of countryside living. It is unbelievable that green agricultural land that is currently being actively farmed is going to be converted into a housing estate and industrial estate depriving the future generation of nature and natural wildlife. Preserving a few trees as per Bassetlaw Council's plan is in no way comparison to the wildlife that live here. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that can be utilised for this purpose. There are protected species like swallows and grass snake that live here and depend on other species such as rabbit and field mice to survive! When we challenged the council at a local consultation meeting on why Greenfield was being used rather than Brownfield, the reply was that it is easier and quicker to put houses up in Greenfield as compared to Brownfield which requires cleaning up. We find this reason completely unacceptable. You are appointed as planner so plan properly and dont find an easy way out, for goodness sake. Currently there is no mains sewage or gas supply in the proposed area. Therefore, more destruction of nature will be required in order to set this up. Chose to live in the country, to be in harmony with nature, for the future generation to understand the balance of this. The council are robbing us of this right and choice we made and are forcing us to live amongst 4000 other homes (and as we understand it industrial area) in a polluted environment with no care for nature or the future generation by bringing destruction to Greenfield and the wildlife that live here. This is not the life future generation want and it is time for planners to understand this. Remember we have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors but have borrowed it from our children. Let us please not destroy the earth we life in for our future generation. As planners we put our hopes and future in your hands. Please don't let us down by destroying the world we live in. Dont destroy the countryside. There are other alternatives to building on non-agricultural land, as planners please engage your brains and dont just look for easy route out. Think about the future, think about your children's future and the future of many generations to come. They will NOT thank you for destroying their countryside and putting up thousands of houses. Don't leave the Earth in a destroyed state for the younger generation. Don't deprive them of greenfield and nature and the right to grown up and enjoy the countryside. Don't be one of the planners that the future generation will be disappointed in!</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates brownfield sites for development but there is not enough brownfield sites available to meet housing needs. Some greenfield land is required. This includes the Garden Village. Impacts on the environment will be identified and mitigated through technical assessments such as ecological assessments to identify impacts on wildlife.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF337	Resident	<p>The location of this proposal is absolutely unacceptable as it is going to destroy 216 hectares of Greenfield site still being actively farmed. As a result of this proposal farmers will loose their livelihood and home. The local green landscape will be completely destroyed and replaced with housing and industrial estate. This will affect the local's amenities to enjoy the pleasure of countryside living. It is unbelievable that green agricultural land that is currently being actively farmed is going to be converted into a housing estate and industrial estate depriving the future generation of nature and natural wildlife. Preserving a few trees as per Bassetlaw Council's plan is in no way comparison to the wildlife that live here. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Bassetlaw that can be utilised for this purpose. There are protected species like swallows and grass snake that live here and depend on other species such as rabbit and field mice to survive! When we challenged the council at a local consultation meeting on why Greenfield was being used rather than Brownfield, the reply was that it is easier and quicker to put houses up in Greenfield as compared to Brownfield which requires cleaning up. We find this reason completely unacceptable. You are appointed as planner so plan properly and dont find an easy way out, for goodness sake. Currently there is no mains sewage or gas supply in the proposed area. Therefore, more destruction of nature will be required in order to set this up. We chose to live in the country, to be in harmony with nature, for the future generation to understand the balance of this. The council are robbing us of this right and choice we made and are forcing us to live amongst 4000 other homes (and as we understand it industrial area) in a polluted environment with no care for nature or the future generation by bringing destruction to Greenfield and the wildlife that live here. This is not the life future generation want and it is time for planners to understand this. Remember we have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors but have borrowed it from our children. Let us please not destroy the earth we life in for our future generation. As planners we put our hopes and future in your hands. Please don't let us down by destroying the world we live in. Dont destroy the countryside. There are other alternatives to building on non-agricultural land, as planners please engage your brains and dont just look for easy route out. Think about the future, think about your children's future and the future of many generations to come. They will NOT thank you for destroying their countryside and putting up thousands of houses. Don't leave the Earth in a destroyed state for the younger generation. Don't deprive them of greenfield and nature and the right to grown up and enjoy the countryside. Don't be one of the planners that the future generation will be disappointed in!</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates brownfield sites for development but there is not enough brownfield sites available to meet housing needs. Some greenfield land is required. This includes the Garden Village. Impacts on the environment will be identified and mitigated through technical assessments such as ecological assessments to identify impacts on wildlife.</p>
REF338 -	Resident	<p>Strongly oppose Policy ST3 setting out the Council's vision for the new Bassetlaw Garden Village and consider the approach to be unsound, unfeasible and unviable. I think that the Garden Village will harm the vitality and viability of Retford town centre and will cause harm to the community of Babworth. The Council's priority should be to enhance existing settlements such as Retford where development can benefit from existing transport networks and support the local economy and wider rural hinterlands rather than attempting to create a new village and transport hub which I do not think is viable. In realty, the Garden Village will simply add traffic to Retford's town centre. The allocation of dwellings within Ranby village should be vastly reduced and the Garden Village idea scrapped.</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.</p>
REF345 -	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>The infrastructure of the Five Lane Ends junction will see slow traffic for a number of years sitting outside their village on the A1 this is noisy and creates pollution some kind of acoustic barrier would go some way to alleviate this on the North Bound A1 by Elkesley approval and development of this prior to the works on 5 lane ends would go some way to get residents on side.</p>	<p>A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF347	NJL Consulting	The objective of a Garden Village is broadly supported, particularly where it can (alongside other strategic objectives) deliver a step change in the regeneration and growth prospects of Bassetlaw. It is important that the Garden Village policies do not inadvertently link the delivery of the new settlement to the adjacent Apleyhead Junction allocation (Policy 9; SEM1). Although the wording of Policy ST3 does not link the two sites, later draft Plan references to Policy SEM1(see paragraph 6.4.2 of the plan) do infer a degree of interdependency in terms of economic and housing growth. Policy ST3 should not inadvertently place any infrastructure or delivery requirements on the Apleyhead Junction site or create any other interdependency between it and the garden village. Any such requirements could adversely impact on the ability to deliver significant employment development in the short to medium term.	The two sites are separate. But infrastructure work identifies that both will generate impacts on local infrastructure so it is important the impacts are understood cumulatively.
REF361 -	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>NEW TOWN PROPOSAL It is 8miles between the centre of Retford and the centre of Worksop. Babworth crossing is 1 mile from Retford.The proposal is to build a residential new Town from Babworth Crossing to 5 lane ends ‘Apley Head Junction’ The SEM1 proposal is to extend the industrial commercial area at Manton in a continuous area out to Apley Head Junction on the West of the A1, the west side of the A1access junction from the proposed residential New Town. The proposal would create a residential New Town urban extension. to the East of Apley Head junction with the industrial commercial area attached but running West to Worksop, to create a continuous residential and industrial commercial area stretching from Worksop Manor, Rhodesia and Shiroaks to Babworth crossing. A continuous built up area of over 8 miles. All this on the edge of Clumber Park and the dukeries. The existing area designated is an attractive wooded agricultural area , more agricultural East of Apley Head junction,but the whole area thinly populated by the odd farm and cottage. Tourism and leisure which tend to be focused on Clumber Park and the Dukeries is likely to be discouraged by the Apley Head proposals. This will be damaging for Bassetlaw as leisure and tourism growth is desirable, and is likely to be achievable. Tourism and leisure has the ability to replace the industrial and commercial jobs where A1 and automation are going to reduce the traditional jobs in that sector that Bassetlaw has attempted to attract. There is a logic in extending the industrial commercial area from Manton, as there are no residents to consider between there and the Apley Head Junction. There is an abundance of industrial and commercial land in Bassetlaw in any case. A lower population below retirement age is envisaged. So there is likely to be lower demand for industrial commercial jobs. More jobs in the tourism and leisure sectors will mean Bassetlaw will not be short of employment opportunities. There is a surplus of proposed employment sites in the Bassetlaw Draft Plan. A lower working age population with growth in the retired non working older population. A large proportion of the employment land is likely not to be required for Bassetlaw jobs , but may provide employment for commuter’s traveling into Bassetlaw. There is mention of a railway station, however officers at Nottinghamshire County Council have not been approached. Transport for the North has not been approached, I am a board member there. The support of these public bodies would be needed to take this forward, but British rail would need to agree as they are the body who would have to find the investment needed. I am not aware that they are even aware that a station is to be included in the Bassetlaw draft plan. Even the size envisaged for the projected New Town housing development is unlikely to justify a railway Station at Apley Head, as the road connections are likely to satisfy transport requirements. The demand, in even the large size envisaged will not be sufficient to justify the investement with the demanding infrastructure and improvement programmes in the North, from this government and future governments, in the coming decades. There will be much better investment opportunities and more demanding projects, benefitting larger numbers of people between the existing Towns and cities of the North and upgrading existing stations. It is usually considered acceptable to walk for 20minutes or more to a train station for commuting purposes and regular use. Accepting this would make a lot more land along the Western side of Worksop available and usefull, around the Western Side of Worksop, and Rhodesia , and there is already a Western by pass relief road in existance there providing adequate vehicular capacity and access. Access to Nottingham and the Derbyshire small towns can be obtained by rail from Worksop and the Shireoaks station. Development and improvement of the existing rail station at Shireoaks has the greatest probability of success, simply because it already exists. I f there was a will to locate more people in the future to the West of Worksop , the apley Head New Town would be unlikely to be needed in the timescale envisaged and linked to the draft plan. The West of Worksop has the advantages of easy access to health facilities at Bassetlaw hospital and easy access to Doncaster and Sheffield hospitals.</p>	The evidence shows that a high number of jobs is expected over the plan period and this needs to be balanced with the number of dwellings delivered. This is a requirement of national policy. A governance structure is in place with in principle support of key stakeholders.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
		The station provides easy access to Sheffield and the cities of the North by rail for communities and business travellers. The Apley Head New Town is proposed in any case as overspill for Sheffield City Region. There was an understanding that Bassetlaw would take the influx. If this Sheffield based influx were to be removed from the building demand it would be seen that there would be no requirement for the Apley Head New Town. The projected building requirements are projected to provide a wide margin of additional homes, above the projected population generated requirements. An element of environmental luxury is proposed for the Apley Head Newtown, and this is usual with Bassetlaw planners to provide such envious conditions for people moving into Bassetlaw and yet leave the local residents in Bassetlaw permanently deprived. This can be seen in the way planning permissions are being granted in East Markham for instance where the 20% increase in planning permissions has been granted, the cap exceeded, in developments out of character with that previous garden village, on Beckland hill and Mark Lane for instance. This is an urban extension in practice. The proposal will fragment country areas	
REF368 -	National Grid	Map of National Grid assets at the Garden Village provided.	Noted.
REF372	Morton Nurseries	For forty years I have lived on the 's' bend on the B6420 and it has always been an extremely dangerous bend with a great many cars ending up in my garden/ditch every year. Another issue is with regards to my nursery entrance which is situated 250 metres on from the railway crossing. A suggestion has been made that there may be a flyover over the railway crossing and my concern would be how this would impact my business.	A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.
REF377 -	Resident	Support for the efforts of Bassetlaw DC to produce a Local Plan and SA. Believe that the Garden Village (ST3) are excellent ideas.	Support noted and welcome.
REF383	Resident	In recent years, upwards of a dozen significant schemes have been granted planning permission on sites in and around Retford. The inevitable result has been to put pressure on the infrastructure to the point that services and facilities such as schools, medical services, traffic, parking, drainage etc...have been stretched to the limit. Further development on a large scale in Retford would aggravate the situation referenced to above, therefore we support the proposal to develop Morton.	Support noted and welcome.
REF402	Resident	While receiving the need for homes – particularly affordable homes and social housing, concerned about the scale of the Garden Village proposal. A potential increase of around 4000 homes without supporting infrastructure will have a huge impact within the immediate locality. What is a green and pleasant rural environment will have gone forever. I am not sure that it is a good idea. Quality of life is a crude expression but it means a great deal. The countryside is a strategic reality in that ideal.	The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs.
REF403	Resident	Yet more housing built near to very busy motorway causing health risks from traffic fumes. The new development opposite Westmoor added to the village will actually join the outskirts of Worksop together making a large town. The junction of Mansfield Road and the A620 at Babworth is too small for the increasing traffic and needs a roundabout. Housing density too high.	A Transport Assessment will ensure traffic impacts from the development are assessed and mitigation identified.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF406	Resident	<p>Against this proposal. Too big. Simply way too big. Too many houses in a rural area in one place The disruption will cast an incredibly long period. The traffic is lowering the quality of life already before and to 4000 extra homes and industrial area is included! Talk of a new train station is folly. It can only detract from Worksop and Retfords existing stations over a short way either side. Why not put money into those two stations. Also many would drive to Retford station for more choice of destination from there. Also no one would take a train to Retford itself because of the distance into town so the very concept would fail. More car journeys into Retford would be taken. The road network and particularly junctions (already highly congested) would set a huge unsustainable increase in traffic. Why not put money into smaller more acceptable developments and more environment. Why not develop the centre of Retford Town to help the struggling high street. There are many ageing sites where homes can be built – even above the areas etc...Get people back into towns, not outside. The A1 is an immensely busy road when it gets blocked and congested which it regularly does. The traffic pull of around this junction (5 lane ends) and Blyth, and Elkesley and block all the surrounding roads with this site of proposed development there would be a dreadful standstill and road blocks and ques. It would inherently change the fabric of the surrounding countryside. With Blyth and Babworth and Morton industrial areas and including Retford and Worksop industrial developments not at capacity, is another large industrial area really needed or desired. Years of disturbance with development etc... would seem never ending for a wide community.</p>	<p>The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. Brownfield sites are identified in the Plan but there are not enough available to meet needs. Some greenfield sites are required.</p>
REF408	Resident	<p>Oppose the building of the garden village. As the owner of Babworth rescue kennels the village will be on our doorstep. Anyone living near will be subject to our dogs barking constantly day and night. This will lead to complaints to the Council who will no doubt put a noise abatement order on us or close us down. Been here for 18 years and moved to this location so the dogs would not be a problem to any near neighbours so putting an entire village next door is beyond comprehension. The loss of farming land that has been farmed for generations. Loss of habitat for the birds and wild animals. Mansfield Road is already a very heavy traffic road with a village of this size the increase in traffic would be unbearable. The entire road has no footpaths for pedestrians to walk so this in itself is a danger to anyone living in the village. Since moving here we have already seen our property decrease in value due to now being surrounded by solar farms and our view from every window is panels and now you want to put an entire village on our doorstep.</p>	<p>Appropriate measures such as use of green infrastructure, and the location of dwellings will be built into the design to ensure that the existing business is not affected.</p>
REF409	Resident	<p>Loss of arable land therefore drainage and food production. Roads wholly unsuitable not maintained or wide enough Threat to BARK dog rescue from new residents complaints Drainage/sewer waste from where to where? Public Transport – railway? But what about buses? How will you staff a public health centre and at what stage. Retford GPs are at limit. What facilities are planned for adolescents? What proportion of the housing are meant for first time buyers and +55s What services will be available e.g. gas, water. What are quality employment surely not more sandwich factories? Why will electric cars minimise flood risk?</p>	<p>In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. Brownfield sites are identified in the Plan but there are not enough available to meet needs. Some greenfield sites are required.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST03 - Garden Village			
REF418	Resident	1. All residents will be complaining about dogs barking and noise from the rescue. 2. We moved here so dogs wouldn't bother people with noise. 3. Fireworks come November/New Year will scare already scared animals.4. Road is not suitable for an increase of traffic 5. Kids will try to upset dogs from the other side of the tracks when bored. 6. You've already wrecked the area with thousands of solar panels. 7. Destroying good farm land 8. We have been here 18 years and employ 4 staff on full time wages caring for abused animals. You have wrecked our view from our house don't allow this on good farm land like you did the solar farms for a back pocket donation which never reached anyone who was affected by your decision to allow these solar farms.	Appropriate measures such as use of green infrastructure, and the location of dwellings will be built into the design to ensure that the existing business is not affected.
REF425	Resident	Cannot see it being beneficial to Retford area as there are no industries left "no jobs" not enough medical positions to support such an expanse of housing. Traffic will be a problem roads at present are not sufficient for the amount of vehicles. All the industries that were in the Retford area have gone and housing estates built on there.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period. An appropriate strategy will be prepared to ensure that housing growth is distributed proportionately across the District in line with the settlement hierarchy. But not all growth can be provided for in the Main Towns and through sustainable development in the rural villages. The Garden Village provides an opportunity to meet the District's housing and employment needs. The Local Plan is providing for 11.11ha of employment land in Retford to local jobs needs.
REF428 -	Resident	A great idea but why so near the A1, properties were compulsory purchased approximately 23 years ago as the A1 was to be widened. The A1 must be widened at some point so plans should reflect this.	Further discussions with Highways England will determine the extent of any land required.
REF475 -	Resident	Do not support. The requirement for housing is understood, this however appears very poorly considered with no understanding of the costs involved in this proposal. It comes across as easy solutions to the problem on paper. To be so close to Retford (and to some degree Worksop) but too far to easily access them seems a problem waiting to happen. The proposed train station will cost millions and is restricted in times. It is also an inconvenient line. This will result in people choosing to drive which will strain roads/traffic/parking. Shops etc will bring people away from the town centre. This area of land is also very good for growing crops despite its current classification. Better locations are available.	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period.
REF480	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	4) The site at Morton seems to have a credible transport plan and will be able to sustain a community (train station, and close to major road network which limits the impact although doesn't negate it). Have concerns that there appears to be no firm commitment to when these crucial infrastructure projects would take place (accept BDC has ltd scope)	In January 2020 the Garden Village was at an early stage. As the Local Plan progresses more detail in relation to infrastructure will be available and will be added to the Plan. The Garden Village is necessary to help meet the District's housing and employment needs over the plan period.
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	It is assumed that the transport hub will be on the site of the former Chequerhouse station, which should become the site for a garden village station.	The transport hub will be located at an appropriate position on the railway line following consultation with Network Rail.