

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1175882	Resident	Raise concern over the ability of the rural infrastructure to handle a "large rural development" - This description is also used to describe Tuxford and Blyth. Treswell and Leverton would struggle to accommodate the traffic without a new route to Retford, which would be the nearest town. Suggest some though required around roads. New garden village next to A1 makes complete sense, but Cottam will need some planning - The trunk road avoids the villages which is fine for wagon traffic off the A1 but people living there once all complete will be travelling to Retford and the roads aren't geared up to this in my opinion.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1176658	Resident	Badly polluted site , polluted soil , asbestos & waste, also close to Live gas Power station, & a large Gas supply pipe,Electrical switch gear,not really the place to bring up children.also its an area of low or no development being outside any village	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1177309	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Support the redevelopment of the Cottam Power Station site but am concerned that the infrastructure requirements don't go far enough. Most of the villages in the east of the district are accessed through other villages. This means traffic volumes are increasing year on year, without appropriate investment. To make this part of the district "developable", there needs to be major upgrades to Laneham Road and/or the creation of a new road that serves Treswell, Rampton, Cottam, the Levertons, Woodbeck and Laneham. Infrastructure planning also needs to consider the likely redevelopment of West Burton during the plan period. Coupled with Cottam /High Marnham redevelopment, this is likely to lead to more north-south traffic in the eastern part of the district, and we need to prepare for this. It will ultimately help to rebalance the district away from the Worksop / Retford /Harworth & Bircotes monopoly on resources which is to be encouraged – but it must be done in the right way and with a strong commitment to enhancing access beyond the current road network which already has limitations.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site including from traffic can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1183729	Resident	The development of this site, initially 450 dwellings and thereafter 1150, will completely destroy this rural aspect of the River Trent. Object to this development based on the following: Light pollution and noise from this new village which would be set in the countryside. How do you envisage Torksey Street within this plan - currently used by dog walkers, horse riders and walkers. Building on flood zones - don't Councils ever learn! Adjacent to LNR - the impact from dogs walking on this valuable site has not been assessed. 450 dwellings equates to minimum of 100 dogs (based on UK figures). Add to this cat population and the effect on the bird population. Where are these people going to work? Lincoln, Doncaster, Newark. Villages like Rampton and Tresswell would be used as shortcuts to main roads. Farm traffic is a local part of this road system, not ideal from a traffic perspective. I moved here with cattle in the meadow behind my home and limited light, noise, traffic etc. If I wanted to live in sight of a housing estate I would have moved near Retford. Councils should develop redundant areas of towns for homes, close to where people can work.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
1184447	Resident	in regard to cottam power station,i think it ill conceived ill thought out and will create a total nightmare for the surrounding villages. The roads now are not fit for purpose,i shudder to think what it will be like if it comes to pass. How are you going to police it by the way you can't do that now. whoever dreamed this up is certainly not living in this area	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input.
REF009	Resident	Really hope this will happen it will make such a difference to our villages especially Cottam it's such a scruffy village now, be so lovely to have lovely houses and not cottam chimneys.	Support noted and welcome.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF013	Resident	<p>5:4:13 “-providing the services and facilities which - are lacking in this part of the District for many years. This is a massive insult to the local communities, the Council have deliberately refused development in the local area saying “it is unsustainable”. The local area has become stagnating dormitory villages, why the sudden change? Disappointed with the way this proposed development has been dropped on the local area. No objection to building new houses but why does it have to be so concentrated in one place. This development is about as far away from Retford as you can possibly get. Over the years landowners and local residents have made countless requests for sympathetic infill and generic growth in the area. Only a few have passed with the majority being turned down. It may be hindsight but had all or most of those requests been approved there may not have been this rush to meet government housing quotas now. A few years ago applied for a planning pre-application on the field adjacent to our house, it cost us in the region of £500.00 to be told “the development was unsustainable”. I asked the planning officer “did he visit our site?” He wouldn’t answer the question, it led me to believe he never visited our site and we paid £500.00 for the privilege, how can a desk driven decision be acceptable? In another case a planning application was made by the resident living next door to Sundown Adventureland. The resident appealed the planning refusal, at appeal he was refused saying “there were no footpaths from his house to Rampton village, and as a result he would need a car to go to the local shop. How galling is that when there are thousands of car journeys made to Sundown Adventureland every year, is one car more or less going to make so much of a difference? 3b) makes reference to a convenience store of up to 500²m, (Aldi store in Retford is in the region of 1,500²m). Traditionally convenience stores usually charge RRP which can be 25% or more above “high street” prices. There is no real incentive for residents to shop local. “The Plan” doesn’t mention any more shops in the later phase(s)? How will residents get their weekly/monthly “big shop”? If only one resident does their “big shop” by car it makes a mockery of the decision metered out to the resident next to Sundown. In light of this that decision should be overturned. If this involves additional cost to the applicant it should be waived as a gesture of good will.</p>	<p>National planning policy sets the approach to housing delivery and this continues to change so that each area contributes to the Government's national housebuilding targets. The Local Plan must respond positively to national policy. The proposed shop was intended to be used for local everyday needs and not to cater for a large shopping trip.</p>
REF013	Resident	<p>As a member of the Treswell with Cottam community concerned about the ramifications for our Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The Government says “Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided, and grant planning permission for the new buildings they want to see go ahead. Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to plan for the types of development to meet their community’s needs and where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area”. Our NDP encompasses Treswell Village, Cottam Village, the immediate area in-between and the former Cottam Power Station Site. The former Cottam Power Station Site has been of concern since its closure. Now it appears there is no shared vision. Have usurped our NDP for us to determine our neighbourhood and the shape and development of growth in our local area. No mention of the River Trent being used for tourism and/or leisure in a possible “Burton Waters type development”? 5:4:17 “Use of green infrastructure will ensure the continued separation of the site from the villages of Rampton and Cottam ensuring their individual character distinctiveness and identities are protected” When looking at the area outlined in red it is clear that the western boundary of the development abuts All Saints Church Rampton, Torksey Road. What is the proposed area and composition of this green infrastructure, what is the timescale for it to become mature? Also applies to the north/north western aspects facing Cottam Village. No green infrastructure will be enough due to the close proximity of the site to Cottam Village, it will undoubtedly affect the identity of Cottam Village.</p>	<p>All of the neighbourhood plans in Bassetlaw need to be in general alignment with the planning strategies that sit above them, those being the Core Strategy / Bassetlaw Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst the Cottam Power Station site is a significant feature in Treswell and Cottam Parish it is appropriate that its future is being managed in the first instance through the Bassetlaw Local Plan. The site is ‘strategic’ - it has significance beyond the local area and the size of the site is significant, exceeding other potential development sites in Bassetlaw. The site straddles two parishes, and abuts others, many of which are also producing neighbourhood plans. This means that the Local Plan is the most effective vehicle to manage the potential future uses of this site, it having the potential to address these various complexities in a comprehensive manner. Neighbourhood plans provide an invaluable means to address the fine details of the local area, they are unable to influence issues beyond their boundaries. This does not mean that neighbourhood plans will not have a role to play. The made Treswell with Cottam Neighbourhood Plan 2019, did not address Cottam Power Station directly in its policies, as the site was still active as a power station at the time. The current work to review the Neighbourhood Plan provides a useful opportunity to update the context, to address the proposals for the Power Station, and to consider if and how the</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
			Neighbourhood Plan can complement the approach being proposed by the Council.
1193061	Resident	Disagree that Cottam has good potential as a new large rural settlement. It is quite a distance from Retford with poor local transport links and facilities.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways can be suitably mitigated. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1193338	Resident	Live in Rampton, close to the current Cottam Power Station site which was of course decommissioned late last year. Sad to see the back of such a fantastic employer and such an iconic building that has been a part of the local landscape for over 50 years. But of course, you have to move with the times as the country turns it back on fossil fuels. Looking at the plans proposed, it could see 1,600 homes built on the site. Concerns are whether the current infrastructure can cope and whether the plan has realistically thought about such a massive influx of people to this rural area. It certainly wouldn't be unlikely that these homes would see 2,000 cars (at least) on local roads. While the power station generated traffic when operational, this was minimal in comparison and mainly at peak times (shift changes). There is just one suitable access road to the village and Cottam is very cut off; the current village is very small. Would demand be there for these homes? There is no school, post office, shop, leisure facilities or parks and the current transport links I would rate as very poor. The provisional plans hadn't even considered the railway line that brought coal to the power station. The railway line, which links to both Retford and Gainsborough (with further links elsewhere such as Doncaster and Sheffield), is there and in relatively good condition. Would there be a feasibility report on perhaps opening this line and creating a passenger service? Accept that this is not a simple task but if this site did see 1,600 homes built alongside the current local population in neighbouring villages demand would be there. It is laziness to see such a large brownfield site available and see it as an easy way to reach the national target of new housing without thinking of impact on the local area. Alongside the obvious contamination of it being home to a working coal fired power station for over 50 years, no comment has been made on the gas fired plant which is still very much operational and has no immediate plans to close? I have been made aware that the power lines and grid substation will remain and doubt anyone would want to live so close to this. Perhaps another energy hub much like the one considered for High Marnham might be more suitable.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways can be suitably mitigated, and that alternative options such as rail have been considered. Any development would need to provide for supporting infrastructure including local shops, school, leisure facilities and open space to meet local needs. The gas fired plant and power lines is expected to remain and appropriate mitigation would be required to ensure its operation does not adversely affect future residents or the operation of the business. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1193617	Headon-cum-Upton, Grove and Stokeham Parish Council	The first is the level of new or improved infrastructure to be provided to facilitate a development of this scale. The council is concerned about any impact on our villages, which may occur due to the large volume of extra traffic in the area. Secondly, surely making use of the existing train line, and provision of a station, would make good sense. Not just for the benefit of the Cottam development, but also for the wider community."	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways can be suitably mitigated, and that alternative options such as rail have been considered.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF099	Resident	Object to the Cottam development on the following basis: • It is in a rural location and should remain as such. Light and noise pollution relating to 1500 homes; • Additional cars c2000 min; • Small, narrow local roads cannot cope • Local roads extra traffic combined with farm vehicles • Unknown what developer would do with Torksey Street • Current footpath adjacent to Power Station used by horse riders, cyclists, motorcyclists – this needs addressing; • L.N.R. impact from dog walking. Could be minimum of 1000 dogs! And cats. • Buildings on floodzones – madness • Currently can't walk to flood bank as area has been flooded for months • Where are these people going to work? Doncaster, Newark, Worksop. Impact on local roads.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk can be suitably mitigated and that residents can easily move around by sustainable and public transport. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1194464	Resident	1) Regeneration of the Cottam Site must not be allowed to be 'piecemeal' which will not ensure that the required services and support will be built and provided as the site develops. 2) The roads towards the east will be inundated with additional and unacceptable traffic loads thrust onto the already overloaded road network. This will occur if development is given the go ahead as construction traffic will use the shortest route and you do not have the facilities to deal with transgressors. 3) This low lying area will probably be susceptible to flooding and the additional 'hard paving' by additional roadways and buildings with hard paved areas surrounding them will only exacerbate that flooding..	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk can be suitably mitigated and that residents can easily move around by sustainable and public transport. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input. This will ensure development is not piecemeal.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF115	Canal and River Trust	<p>Welcome consideration given to this site, which should help to provide certainty to future developers and decision makers with regards to how this large brownfield site will be brought back into use following its use as a power station. Due to the former use of the site and its proximity to the River Trent and Local Wildlife Sites, it is important that any redevelopment of the site seeks to fully remediate the site and prevent any contamination towards the nearby watercourse. Welcome reference towards the need for remediation and protection of the watercourse to ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 170. Recommend that consideration is given towards the incorporation of waterborne freight to deliver construction materials and aggregates to site. The redevelopment of the site would require the importation of a significant amount of construction material and aggregates to site. The River Trent forms a direct route to the Humber Ports (and marine sourced aggregate) which could be provided to the location without the need for HGV traffic. The use of the waterway for the transportation of waterborne freight, especially bulk materials and 0 of sustainable transport which can help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion on the local highway network. The Trent is identified by the Trust as a Freight waterway, capable of handling waterborne freight. Efforts to mitigate against the adverse impacts of traffic are promoted by NPPF paragraph 102 and in the case of larger loads, is the governments water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal loads. Correspondence from the Department for Transport to PINS highlights the policy position for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads by water, and the advisory role of Highways England.</p> <p>https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/wpp_letter.pdf NPPF Paragraph 148 highlights that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. Waterborne freight can help accord with this aim, as carbon emissions by water are demonstrably lower when compared to other forms of transit, such as road transport. Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA), using a case study of the transport of steel by water, highlights that carbon emissions of transport by water can be 45% lower than that of comparative transport by road. http://www.cboa.org.uk/downloads/environmental_impact_report.pdf Request that the policy wording and/or explanatory text is expanded to ensure that future consideration is given to the use of the River Trent to transport construction materials to the site (and to export any waste materials from the site). This could be undertaken through the expansion of part 4 (Transport and Movement) of the policy with the following suggested text: "b) Consideration should be given towards opportunities to utilise the River Trent for the transportation of construction and waste materials to and from the site during redevelopment.</p>	Consideration of the use of the River Trent for transportation, for freight and construction materials will be added to the supporting text.
REF117	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>Like to know more about the proposed housing and whether it will fit within Rampton & Woodbeck Neighborhood Plan, and what infrastructure is planned to support such a large development. The parish boundary between Rampton and Cottam, half of the power station itself is within Rampton Parish and with the bottom three and a half cooling towers with our parish, therefore any homes built on our side of the boundary line, regardless of the name of the new settlement or where the access is from, is within our parish and the precept, any cil money, s106 money from will be to Rampton & Woodbeck parish council for those homes and not to Treswell Parish Council, only those homes built north of the boundary line will be to Treswell with Cottam Parish, how many of the initial 450 homes and how many of the total 1650 homes will be within our parish and how many will be within Treswell With Cottam parish? Why has there been no detail around the sort of houses that would be built, detached, bungalows, semi's, social and numbers of those proposed. Why is there no clear definition to where the houses will be, are they only on the former cottam site itself rather than the surrounding farmland owned by edf. Would the train line be used and a station opened so people can travel by rail from there. How many drs spaces will be created in local surgeries or will a new drs be built. Will a community centre be built. Will there be shops and a village green? Would the local communities of Treswell/Rampton etc be allowed to say the design and layout of the community as it is split into both parishes? Why is this allowed in addition to the housing allocated in the Treswell and Rampton neighbourhood plans. What flood protection is there will there be? How will access to the Seymour drain be garrenteed for the local drainage board. Wont the houses be surrounded by pylons, a grid connection and the Uniper Gas Power Station in the middle of the development, or is the Gas station closing in the next 15 year too? Are you aware of badgers and gt chrested newts in the pond areas around the former site and will they be protected. Why does it say 1200 more homes thereafter with no defined timescale for the build. How much S106 money will it generate for Treswell and</p>	The regeneration of the Cottam Power Station site is recognised as an important but longer-term proposal for the District. Details about what will be delivered on the site are not yet fully developed, and the role of the Bassetlaw Local Plan is to provide a broad framework to guide this going forward. Key to this will be a masterplan for the site, to be produced by the developers and agreed by the Council, which will provide greater detail about what is proposed, and supported by relevant evidence. This is a sizeable, strategic site that will likely have impacts beyond the immediate local area. As such, the evidence to support any proposals will draw upon a similar geography but also to acknowledge the immediate context of the site, including the surrounding parishes and their settlements, and how any proposals seek to respond to this. The contents of the Rampton and Woodbeck Neighbourhood Plan, alongside the neighbourhood plans of other neighbouring parishes, should provide invaluable points of reference to this effect, alongside broader evidence base studies.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
		<p>Rampton Parishes. How much CIL money will it generate for Treswell & Rampton Parishes and is it expected that the parish councils provide playparks, a community centre and other parish facilities or will Bassetlaw provide these?</p>	
REF117	Rampton and Woodbeck Parish Council	<p>Have you consulted with both Anglian Water and with Severn Trent as a place bigger than Tuxford is now, will need its own sewage works and may need a small water works or an upgrade with a booster station from the nearby works. Where will all the people work? as no extra jobs are being created. The plan is so vague and lacking in detail, several people find it hard to know what to object to and what to support. Will the design, and style of homes be consistent with the types of homes that are wanted and dictated within our Neighbourhood Plan. Will any of the homes be built on farmland currently owned by EDF or will it all be just on the existing power station site. What is the lifespan of the Uniper Gas Power Station at Cottam? Are the homes to be built around this or is the gas station going to Before it entered decommissioning, the Cottam Power Station Manager stated that the future of the site was to include the largest batter storage device in the UK to deal with peaks and troughs on the national grid, is this still taking place and having homes built around it? Do you have any plans to force the Highways Authority to adopt Torksey Ferry Road out of Rampton and pave the road as a southern access to the site? Is there any contamination on the site from the former coal, slag and any asbestos or chemicals that need thoroughly cleaning away before it can be built on? • Elderly people in the village who helped build the power station in the 1960's state that all sorts of rubbish, including the diggers and building equipment and vehicles were buried underneath the base of the power station, because in those days Health & Safety was not a thing it is today and they just chucked all this waste and things there, this would need dealing with before homes built on top. • Lack of details plans re infrastructure, Dunham and Leverton Schools are full to capacity, Rampton has some spare capacity, but not the facilities to take in a large influx of pupils and there is a lack of child minding and preschools/nurseries in the area. Plus the Drs at Leverton would struggle and it is hard to recruit medical personnel to rural areas anyway. • The roads situation is far from ideal heading north towards the Gainsborough/Doncaster area. • There was surprise by several councillors at this proposal from bassetlaw because, given that EDF talked about solar farming, and the use of the area for energy generation, and storage via new battery technology, in the past 2 years at the EDF open forum meetings • What about the Impact of traffic on all surrounding villages? • What is the impact on wild fowl, swans and geese and bird life on Trentside areas, This was one of the reasons permission was refused for wind farms some years ago. What gaurentees will there be to protect the Gt Chrested Newts at Cottam, the badgers and bats Lack of any specific detail re buses, a sore point given the withdrawal of frequent bus services to Treswell and Rampton villages.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The site will be supported by a detailed masterplan and its preparation will be subject to public consultation and input. That will show the proposed layout and where different types of development will go and the detailed infrastructure requirements. The Uniper plant is expected to remain on site. Appropriate mitigation will be required to ensure there are no adverse impacts on future residents or the ongoing operation of the business.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1194590	Resident	In my view the former Cottam site is not safe for housing due to ground contamination , it should be developed as a green energy site using small oscillating wind Turbines in line with Bassetlaws green credentials also all large loads from the demolition should be transported by barges utilising the loading dock already constructed this is a green and cost effective mode of transport widely used all over europe ,this should be a condition of law for the demolition company.	Comments noted.
1194599	Resident	Regrowth for rural area is to high and not what was agreed and approved by the NDP steering group. As a resident I do not wish to see anymore new builds in our rural community. Bassetlaw have met their quota on new builds already. I move to this area to get away from the hussle and bussle of town life not to be crammed back into another. Insufficient draining and flooding. Increased traffic. Lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. Rural environment will be lost. Insufficient drainage and flooding already. The adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs. Protected species already on the site. Subsidence already occurring in Cottam and surrounding. Noise & traffic pollution and increased crime rates. Would like to see something greener and environmentally friendly. The connection to the national grid is already in place so we are 50% there.	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1194662	Resident	Do not support the redevelopment of the Cottam power station site for residential use,the site is remote from suitable transport links and would impose vastly increased traffic volumes on the rural road network of east Bassetlaw. The rail link is not viable to re connect to lincoln as the old bridge is an ancient monument and preserved in some way and has been converted to pedestrian use as part of the footpath network.The plan goes against the wider concept that east bassetlaw mainly comprises of SMALL villages and hamlets, the scale of the development proposed is parachuting a small town into an area un-fit to accept it. Bassetlaw's housing requirements have already been met by the other allocations proposed under this plan.I propose a more suitable idea for regenerating the Power station site would be to allocate for a Green Energy site with its grid connection and already has permission for a battery storage project.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk can be suitably mitigated and that residents can easily move around by sustainable and public transport. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1195107	Resident	Do not support the plan housing on the site of Cottam power station. The would cause disruption to all the surrounding villages, in particular Cottam. The roads are not of a sufficient standard including a lot of single track roads. Cottam already has to endure HGVs which are travelling to Coates and are not only damaging roads and verges, but are damaging houses due to the vibration caused by these vehicles. The village would potentially add another 2000 vehicles to the routes through all the villages. Develop the existing areas of nature and conservation which already has protected wildlife in existance there; and build a renewable energy site which would have immediate access to the national grid. Bassetlaw has already met its 20% target for housing without building on the Cottam power station site	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1195111	Resident	The use of the land for housing development is inappropriate in the current and predicted climate of ecological and sociological needs of the area . The infrastructure development required to enable free movement of existing and intended residents during the development and as a functioning new and permanent village will be considerable and in complete opposition to a carbon zero future. Surely development of current amenities could take preference and therefore being of benefit to the wider communities of Bassetlaw The location of the site is removed from existing urbanisation and would impact on rural living. The usual issues of increased demand on water, sewerage, energy and the current concerns of flood risk in an area of a tidal river are also real considerations. However we could take a positive view on this location for low risk leisure and green energy power generation, e.g. Solar power or hydro/water turbine power production. Clean energy production to benefit Bassetlaw residents and meeting carbon zero living. Cottam is in a location supporting wildlife, a natural tidal river and the greater ecological systems which should be maintained for future generations. I and many other local residents have chosen to live in rural Bassetlaw. Let's maintain this choice of living and remind ourselves that Bassetlaw is to be congratulated on meeting current housing requirements and future projected needs without this development through the Green Village Scheme. To summarise I object to non-essential residential development of the former Cottam Power Station site.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1195155	Resident	Live directly opposite the power station. The plan to build yet more houses there will be incredibly detrimental to wildlife, grass verges and the amount of pollution. It is a rural area and does not have viable infrastructure such as gps, schools, and hardly any public transport. Have a large amount of industrial traffic passing through and this will add to the noise and disruption that residents have to face on a daily basis. Moved here after being diagnosed with cancer. I wanted to live in peace and quiet. The thought of a massive housing estate and everything that goes with that, just fills me with dread.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF140	Resident	Subject to flood assessment. First it would give motivation to clear the site or it will stay a blot on the landscape for years as EDF would have no motivation to clear it. The site already has both road and rail connections to it. Although you do not mention a railway station the addition of one at this site would have the same benefits as the Bassetlaw Garden Village linking it to Retford and the East Coast mainline.	A requirement of development is that the site submits a Flood Risk Assessment to be agreed with the Environment Agency. Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
1195216	Resident	The railway line into Cottam should be upgraded for passenger traffic to link the new settlement	Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
1195859	Resident	Cottam redevelopment plan. Insufficient draining and flooding. Increased traffic. Lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. Insufficient draining and flooding. The adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs. Pollution. Protected species already on the site. Bassetlaw Council does not need any further new builds.	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc.
1195911	Aspbury Planning Limited	Support the allocation of the former Cottam Power Station site for a mixed-use regeneration led new settlement. This is a 'new' addition to the housing supply in the 2020 Draft Plan and there is little information in the public domain to substantiate delivery which is pretty much all that is presented in this Draft Plan. There appear to be many areas of uncertainty with regard to site reclamation, flood risk ,nature conservation and heritage constraints that it is unsafe to rely on the circa 450 dwellings coming forward in the plan period in this secondary location and counting toward the housing requirement. In this regard it is essential that ST2 is robust in delivering the the housing requirement for Rural Bassetlaw from its large and small rural settlements without relying upon 450 dwellings from Cottam. Not convinced that the delivery policy for the smaller rural settlements will secure delivery of these homes.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196000	Resident	In principle, a good idea, and it makes perfect sense to use the existing land productively. Would like to see more detail about the changes to the roads that would be required. It's clear that, for this to work in line with the environmental objectives, there would need to be better transport links and the provision of services (healthcare, shops, etc). It would also make sense to provide support to public transport to ensure that the impact of car use is minimised.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
			required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196060	Resident	<p>This brown field site, which has a high degree of contamination, and will be very difficult, if not impossible to completely remove, and its total lack of infrastructure could not support such a large housing project without a huge cost, not just to the developer, to Bassetlaw and council tax payers. Nor could the local community support the doubling of its population in such a small geographical area without it causing huge disruption locally and in the wider community. Dunham in the south to Sturton le Steeple in the north has only approximately 1600 houses. This housing project is proposing 1650 houses! That's approximately 6600 people, 3300 car journeys twice a day. At the moment we are told there is no need for such a large amount of housing. It flies in the face of the many protestations wishing for a reduction to climate change ST45 Green infrastructures ST35 our historical environment ST37 as well as our rural heritage assets, villages and rural landscape. ST38 Could the District / County become a carbon neutral, 0 emissions area? By committing to some creative solutions to reduce our carbon footprint? 'Yes We Can' by taking charge of our energy needs for now and in the future. A better use of the site would be to create Renewable energy generation and energy storage. Solar – Solar PV farm. Wind – low profile wind turbines Qr6 Vertical axis wind turbines and Vortex bladeless wind energy. Bio mass, Geothermal, Hydroelectric power including tidal energy generation in the Trent and other rivers in the district by using new types of Water rotor turbines designed to work on slow moving currents and shallow water. Energy Storage – Battery systems similar to the 49mw energy storage only bigger. Creating 'Trent Valley energy generation' or Bassetlaw Renewables. Local Sustainable Micro Energy Generation. incorporating former and current power station. High Marnham Coal Fired Power Station, Cottam Coal fired Power station, and when it closes West Burton coal fired Power Station. When they were first built this part of the Trent was known as 'Megawatt valley' With its built in infrastructure each site has the capacity to continue to supply the grid, the local community and Bassetlaw as it has done for the last 50 years. At the same time Bassetlaw becomes the champion of renewable energy with a realistic carbon neutral target and becoming self-sufficient in energy, future proofing the district's energy needs. It has been predicted our energy demands will triple over the next 50 years. By going into joint ventures with like-minded enlightened partners, and with the local community figuratively and literally buying into the project our district could realistically achieve its ambition, in line with government targets, of 0 emissions in a very short time.</p>	There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site.
REF199	Cushwake	<p>The Council appear to be overly reliant on housing coming forward on the Cottam site. This site will be difficult to bring forward due to its highly contaminated nature and therefore the viability of the site will be challenging without funding assistance. It is considered optimistic that 450 dwellings will be delivered on the site during the plan period and therefore additional sites should be identified to accommodate the shortfall in housing that is likely to arise.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF201	Severn Trent	Note that the local Plan identifies a number of areas as prime locations for redevelopment, whilst we are in general supportive of the re-development of brownfield sites, and understand that there are often additional considerations including contamination that may need to be addressed before development can be carried out. Recommend that that Planning policy looks to ensure that development is carried out in way that will result in wider benefits, including but not limited to separation of surface water connections to foul sewers where possible, and the attenuation of surface water flows as close as reasonably practically to greenfield, this especially where connecting to the sewers. Severn Trent support the inclusion of “the green and blue infrastructure and its amenity value will ensure the area becomes a more attractive place to live,” within paragraph 5.4.6. Care will need to be taken to protect water sources and ensure that redevelopment of sites does not mobilise pollutants due to the underlying aquifer.	Development of brownfield sites will be carried out sensitively to ensure there are wider benefits including through the appropriate provision of water infrastructure and water management. In line with other policies in this Plan care will be taken to ensure future development does not adversely affect the underlying aquifer.
REF201	Severn Trent	Whilst Severn Trent is supportive of the general principles and the inclusion of bullet point 5.d) “An integrated approach to surface water drainage and multifunctional green spaces;” the plan does not provide any mention of the drainage hierarchy. The site is situated adjacent to the River Trent therefore the need to connect surface water to the foul sewers should not be required, this is a key element of ensuring that the development is sustainable and resilient to the future impacts from things like climate change etc. It may also be useful to specifically mention the need to incorporate true SuDS principles that look all 4 pillar of SuDS, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity as well as Quantity. Recommended wording for the considerations are covered under our response to the Bassetlaw Garden Village.	The drainage hierarchy applies to all new development so is better covered by a strategic policies for water management and flood risk and drainage.
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	Enclose a Vision Document (VD) which aims to corroborate the Site’s constraints and opportunities whilst indicating how the legacy of the power station could be delivered through strategic and comprehensive redevelopment. The thrust and overall objective of the policy working towards the delivery of a new large rural settlement is fully supported by EDF. The strategy is considered to be appropriate not only as a long-term sustainable future for the Site but also one that would directly support and enhance the existing communities of Cottam, Treswell, Rampton and beyond. The approach taken is considered to be consistent with the aims of plan making as set out within Chapter 11 of the NPPF, which focusses on making effective use of land. The re-use of this large-scale brownfield site would result in delivery of a substantial number of new homes and environmental improvements that would otherwise be a missed opportunity, instead placing pressure on greenfield sites across other parts of the district. The draft policy in this respect is considered to be prepared on a sound basis. The approach to bringing forward development in accordance with a framework masterplan to be prepared by a developer is welcomed (ST5 B-C). This is considered to be a standard approach to bringing forward large-scale regeneration proposals, ensuring all stakeholders have an opportunity to be consulted on the masterplan’s evolution. Later parts of the policy indicate specific stakeholders such as the Environment Agency and Highways Authority that would need to be involved throughout the planning process, and it is expected that this would include the early stages of masterplanning the Site. Draft Policy ST5 B specifically refers to the importance of phasing arrangements being agreed, and EDF notes that this is likely to be critical to the Site’s successful regeneration. It is predicted that a phasing strategy would focus on those parts of the Site that would ‘unlock’ the wider development site, bringing housebuilders forward on plots of circa 100-150 units to start with, increasing to plots of 200-250 units as development and market interest gather momentum. For a site of this scale it would be normal to expect at least two housebuilders on site at any one time. Good Quality Design and Local Character, sets out criteria to be adhered to within the design and masterplanning process, as well as relating to detailed matters that may come forward during the reserved matters application process. The following points are noteworthy in respect of the corresponding criteria: a) EDF has already taken steps to Screen the demolition process in line with the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations (2017), for which BDC confirmed within its Screening Opinion that an Environmental Statement would not be required. b) Major development of this scale will always be subject to Flood Risk Assessment, but the Site’s context is particularly sensitive in this riverside location. The existing Site has flood defences in place that have not previously been breached and it is expected that an adequate developable area can be achieved without placing additional risk on new homes or other locations up or down stream. c) The Site’s rural location requires a sensitive landscape-led approach and this is welcomed by EDF.	Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>The VD provides an early indication of how the Site could sensitively fit within the landscape, given the comparative visual impact will be significantly reduced following demolition. d) EDF supports the need for sustainable and innovative design, particularly given the Site's unique context. The approach is wholly consistent with the objectives of NPPF e) Whilst it is EDF's strategy to find a developer to purchase the Site to bring forward regeneration proposals, it fully supports the principle of incorporating localised green energy production, including enhanced transport connections such as exploring rail connection opportunities. f) EDF would expect a future developer of the Site to engage with Nottinghamshire County Council as minerals authority to ensure that no conflicts existed between regenerating the Site and realising any extraction opportunities. Moreover, the challenges of extracting minerals in this flood-sensitive location are likely to be significant. ST5 2: Development Mix The scale of development both in terms of housing and employment land is considered to be realistic. Where demand exists as development starts to come forward, and subject to overcoming the relevant constraints, opportunities may exist beyond the plan period to consider increasing the scale slightly or adjusting the ratio of uses, for example, if employment land take-up is low. Further, it may be possible to include a new primary school on-site subject to the Local Education Authority's requirements and the details of such issues as land-take and funding. a) The split between the number of homes to be delivered within the plan period and those beyond is considered to be realistic. This is based on the broad timescales for decommissioning, demolition, remediation and bringing forward the requisite planning applications prior to commencing infrastructure works and only then commencing onstruction of homes. b) The approach to promoting a mix of housing types is consistent with national policy and could result in a widely beneficial mix of housing to benefit the existing communities, both in terms of bringing affordable homes to the market for those wishing to purchas their first homes through to specialist and care accommodation catering for older people or the infirm. c) The principles of Policy ST45 are broadly supported and EDF advocates a climate resilient to regenerating the Site.d) EDF welcomes an open range of housing densities appropriate to the rural setting. The lack of prescription in this criterion is considered essential so as not to minimise opportunities for delivering a full variety of densities. For example, this could include higher density apartment and care home living through to lower density detached and bungalow accommodation. e) The scale and split of employment land both within and beyond the plan period is considered to be reasonable and would likely be mutually beneficial to establishing market demand for the Site.</p>	<p>Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF207	Gerald Eve on behalf of EDF	<p>Social and Community Facilities EDF comments: a) subject to engagement with the Local Education Authority in terms of assessing demand for school places, an opportunity may exist for a primary school to be provided on site. Regardless, the need for financial contributions to support provision of school places in the surrounding community (assuming a new school on site is not required) is a standard requirement for major residential proposal and is therefore fully supported. b) The Local Centre will provide an important focal point for the community. It is suggested that the policy makes clear the exclusion of any requirement for the sequential test or retail impact assessment to be required during the planning application process, as the quantum and mix of Local Centre uses will most likely be market-driven. The restriction on convenience floorspace of up to 500 sq m should be clarified as gross sales floorspace in order to allow sufficient flexibility in delivery (i.e. for food and/or non-food retailers). c) EDF supports the need for appropriate financial contributions to be made towards health care facilities d) Similarly, the principle of a community hub and sports pitches is fully supported. Other leisure opportunities such as walking and cycling networks are also likely to play an important place-making role in regenerating the Site. Transport and Movement, is noted as an important aspect of the policy to ensure the delivery and also the long-term sustainability of the Site. EDF recognises that the Site is remote from major settlements, with the nearest main town of Retford located approximately 9 miles to the west. The integration of a mix of public transport opportunities, cycle routes and exploration of opportunities to utilise rail and river connections could set the new settlement apart from other rural locations. The need for a detailed and comprehensive transport assessment is supported. It is recognised that the existing road network will need some improvements and EDF supports the need for further investigation into the capacity of key junctions and an assessment of potential traffic flows to consider the specific works needed to support the Site's delivery. Ensuring adequate parking and servicing provision, are considered to be standard criteria for a development site of this scale. Landscape Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure, highlights the key environmental objectives for the Site. Again, EDF considers that these broad objectives are consistent with both the scale of the Site and the corresponding objectives of the NPPF, including Chapters 15 and 16. a) EDF supports the need for an archaeological assessment for the site as well as a wider built heritage assessment that would consider the impacts of regenerating the Site on nearby heritage assets such as the numerous listed buildings within a short distance of the Site boundaries. However, given the existing heavy industrial nature of the Site, it is considered likely that a residential-led regeneration scheme would be sensitive to the b) The Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site is noted as a key environmental asset and should be protected accordingly. EDF support the retention, protection and enhancement of the wetlands through the masterplanning and development process. c) EDF prides itself on ensuring that its impact on the local environment results in no risks to human health or biodiversity. Taking the Site forward, EDF's expectations are to find a responsible developer who would utilise access to the river as an asset to the Site's regeneration, maintaining the highest standards of protection of the river throughout the development process and also via the long-term management of the settlement through a management company. d) A multi-functional drainage strategy and utilisation of sustainable drainage principles is expected as a standard approach for a site of this scale and is therefore supported. Details of drainage would be developed in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency. e) EDF fully supports the need to focus on green infrastructure in the masterplanning of this new rural settlement. Details of the management of these networks would be determined during the planning application process and could involve a mix of private and public management depending on the status of certain routes and facilities. The use of a Planning Performance Agreement to aid the planning application process is welcomed and broadly agreeable subject to detailed matters regarding cost and resource allocation – this would be discussed at the planning application stage. For completeness, it is noteworthy that the policy reference 'ST5 F' should be amended to 'ST5 D'. Minor suggestions are noted above and are consolidated below for ease of reference: 1. Clarifying that the Local Centre would not be subject to sequential test or retail impact assessment 2. Clarifying the convenience retail provision of 500 sq m as gross sales floorspace 3.</p>	<p>Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1196375	Resident	Do not support the housing development in the Cottam Power Station site There is insufficient draining on site and risk of flooding. The villages cannot cope with the increased traffic. There is a total lack of infrastructure doctors, schools, public transport, dentist, shops. There will be an adverse impact on protected trees, plants and wildlife needs protected species already on the site. IT WAS STATED AT THE RECENT MEETING BY A COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE THAT THIS DEVELOPMENT IS NOR REQUIRED TO MEET HOUSING NEEDS IN THE PLAN A RENEWABLE ENERGY SITE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ABOVE HOUSING	The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. There are currently no plans for energy generation on the site.
REF218	Central Lincolnshire	Note and support the policy for the former Cottam Power Station, reserve the right to comment further once the full details of the proposal and any potential impacts are understood.	Thank you for your comments
REF222	Notts CC	Part C, 4, a) The Transport Assessment would need to identify the need for and propose improvements on strategic routes from the site and explore the opportunities to transport goods and people by river and rail. Part C, 4, a) (i) The site already has two large accesses onto Outgang Lane. It is not clear why only one is included within the application area. The main site would benefit from two accesses, the second potentially closer to Cottam village such that the main development area is not served from one large cul-de-sac. Presumably a further access would be required to serve the land to the north of Outgang Lane. Part C, 4, a) (ii) Outgang Lane/Cottam Road is of a reasonably high standard. However, pedestrian and cycle routes are likely to require improvement between the site, the village, and Rampton through the site. These should be secured as part of the development rather than by way of a contribution. Part C, 4, a) (v) Should include a contribution towards public transport	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework and inform infrastructure planning.
REF222	Notts CC	Minerals and Waste As outlined in the Waste Core Strategy (2013) Cottam was one of three power stations in Nottinghamshire and as part of the energy operation, two types of ash are produced: Pulverised Fuel Ash (PFA) and Furnace Bottom Ash (FBA). Whilst most, if not all, PFA is sold and re-used as secondary aggregate in the construction industry, the production of PFA often outstrips market demand for the material and so the remaining PFA material which is not re-used or recycled is disposed as either part of land raising schemes or to reclaim and fill derelict voids. Policy WCS6: Power Station Ash in the Waste Core Strategy outlines how the County Council favours the recycling or re-use of material but where this cannot occur, priority will be given to proposals that use to ash to fill or reclaim mineral workings or derelict voids, with land-raising of ash for disposal only acceptable when no other reasonable options exist. At Cottam, permission was granted to dispose any remaining PFA into two lagoons; the North Lagoon and South Lagoon. Disposal in the north lagoon ceased in 2016, as per condition 5 attached to planning permission 1/12/12/00001, and disposal in the South Lagoon is permitted until 2023 under permission 1/38/12/00001. As the power station has now ceased operation, the ash disposal site is to be restored to the satisfaction of Nottinghamshire County Council and will then enter a 5-year aftercare period. As disposal has ceased in the North Lagoon, this area entered into aftercare in 2016. During the aftercare period, the site will be monitored and assessed by Nottinghamshire County Council to ensure the full and proper restoration of the site to the requirement of the planning permission and so will remain of interest to the County Council from a waste perspective. In terms of this allocation and any potential future application, it will need to consider the restoration plans and aftercare process that have been agreed for the site by the County Council as the Waste Planning Authority. It should also be considered that where PFA has been deposited, these areas are unlikely to be suitable or stable for development and that there is potential that these disposal sites may be re-worked in the future to recover PFA. Such consideration could be included within Policy ST5 and its supporting text. The former Cottam Power Station also lies within the MSA/MCA for sand gravel, which the draft plan recognises in paragraph 5.4.19 and outlines that the County Council will be consulted to ensure it does not lead to the sterilisation of mineral. As Policy SP7 outlines, where a need for	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
		non-mineral development can be demonstrated, prior extraction will be sought where practical. This prevents not only the sterilisation of mineral but also can reduce the waste produced from the construction of the site.	
REF222	Notts CC	This regeneration area falls within the Rampton Primary Planning Area, incorporating Woodbeck and Treswell with Cottam. NCC anticipate that contributions would be required to create 3 additional classrooms within the span of the local plan. Rampton Primary is on a restricted site and would be difficult to expand, so feasibility would be required. The development at Cottam Power Station is anticipated to add a further 1,150 houses after 2037, which would necessitate a new primary school and potentially land on which to build it.	Comments made will be reflected in the future policy framework and inform infrastructure planning.
1196559	Resident	The Head of the environment Agency is now stating that "homes should not be built on flood plains", and that "there is a clue in the name". Well, that is certainly not Rocket Science, and whilst the Policy states that there are Flood Defences the addition of the huge development proposed with again "concrete over" huge areas of land that currently is ably to absorb rainfall. It is presumed that Drains would discharge to the River Trent, thus increasing the risk of overtopping of the River Banks. Again, a proper plan for Traffic to and from this proposed development is woefully missing. How are the new occupants and workers/materials suppliers intended to access the 'out-of-the-way' location ?? It always seems to be the 'Chicken and The Egg' scenario. Roads will follow, we are told and are expected to believe ! If the proposal is allowed traffic needs to be kept away from the villages between this site and Retford, bearing in mind that there are only three ways to go from Cottam. The River is in the way to the East.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196560	Resident	There is a disconnect between the aims and the proposed development at Cottam which will have a massive impact on local communities and cause environmental damage. The plans for this in relating to Cottam development are unrealistic and will cause harm to local communities. The regeneration proposed at Cottam power station will have a negative impact on the existing communities and the infrastructure is not available to sustain such a development.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1196560	Resident	<p>Can see that the council needs to come up with a plan to use the site at Cottam Power Station and manage this. Concerned that this is not the right answer to the problem. Bassetlaw does NOT need the vast number of new homes proposed on this site. It is not the right site for this sort of development 1. the development would dwarf and dominate existing communities. 2. There is no infrastructure in the local areas to support it. 3.The only safe road is the one leading south, and this will cause congestion in the area. It is not safe for traffic to use other nearby roads. The additional traffic will damage local areas, both in terms of the structure of local houses, the noise, the light pollution and the fumes from traffic during the extended building process and after. 4. The area is within a flood plain, accepting parts directly in Cottam Power Station have protection at present, but not all, and this is a serious issue. 5. The site is known to be contaminated, with asbestos and other chemicals. It is not a suitable site for housing to be on or near this. 6. The site is adjacent to the gas power station, which will continue to operate for years ahead, again, this is not a safe and suitable site, and there will be pylons for the electricity generated on or very close to the proposed housing. 7. The local area has very little to support such a development. The doctors' surgeries are under pressure as it is, and even if a new one was built, other rural communities have found it exceptionally difficult to attract doctors to rural areas. 8. The travel to work time will be considerable for residents. There is an exceptionally poor bus service to Cottam and the local villages. Housing should ideally be nearer places of work. There is only one route which delivers on to a major road. 9.All the local communities will be affected in a very negative way. The increased number of cars will give rise to pollution, It is not safe as it is to drive on these roads. The local objections to the enlargement at Sundown Adventure Park made clear the pressure on roads as it is, and this will add to it. Development and additional commercial traffic has already affected the local communities 10. Feeder schools will also be affected as Dunham and Leverton are full, and Rampton has a very old building and could not cope with an influx of new pupils. This could create a "ghetto" estate at Cottam. It is hard, in any case to recruit teachers to rural schools. 11. The proposed shops and commercial business facilities will also affect the local communities negatively, increasing traffic considerably. 12. There is likely to be a negative impact on the environment regarding the existing wild life. The site has a Great Crested Newt colony, and many other wildlife nearby and on it, including wild birds. This situation needs to be enhanced, not be damaged, as it will be by this development. In short, this is the wrong sort of development for this site. However, there is the possibility of an exciting alternative. Agree there is a need for energy generation, and there is a need especially for renewable energy development. This site is ideal for such use. Support the plans presented supported by all from the local communities who have seen them for a creative approach into using this site for green energy development. I am a Parish Councillor, at Rampton and Woodbeck , and everyone I have spoken to and consulted has the same serious reservation and opposition to the proposed development. They do, however, support the use of the site for green energy development. This is a golden opportunity to be forward looking and bring on an exciting and progressive energy development which will benefit all the local residents, and indeed, through the potential profits, all the residents of Bassetlaw. Urge the Council to look again at this proposed development and listen to local objections which are based on solid fact, not "Nimbyism" . This is an excellent opportunity to think outside the box.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. There are currently no plans for energy generation on the site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF231	PETITION	<p>ST5 This brown field site, which has a high degree of contamination, and will be very difficult, if not impossible to completely remove, and its total lack of infrastructure could not support such a large housing project without a huge cost, not just to the developer, to Bassetlaw and council tax payers. Nor could the local community support the doubling of its population in such a small geographical area without it causing huge disruption locally and in the wider community. Dunham in the south to Sturton le Steeple in the north has only approximately 1600 houses. This housing project is proposing 1650 houses! That's approximately 6600 people, 3300 car journeys twice a day. At the moment we are told there is no need for such a large amount of housing. It flies in the face of the many protestations wishing for a reduction to climate change ST45 Green infrastructures ST35 our historical environment ST37 as well as our rural heritage assets, villages and rural landscape. ST38 Could the District / County become a carbon neutral, 0 emissions area? By committing to some creative solutions to reduce our carbon footprint? 'Yes We Can' by taking charge of our energy needs for now and in the future. A better use of the site would be to create Renewable energy generation and energy storage. Solar – Solar PV farm. Wind – low profile wind turbines Qr6 Vertical axis wind turbines and Vortex bladeless wind energy. Bio mass, Geothermal, Hydroelectric power including tidal energy generation in the Trent and other rivers in the district by using new types of Water rotor turbines designed to work on slow moving currents and shallow water. Energy Storage – Battery systems similar to the 49mw energy storage only bigger. Creating 'Trent Valley energy generation' or Bassetlaw Renewables. Local Sustainable Micro Energy Generation. incorporating former and current power station. High Marnham Coal Fired Power Station, Cottam Coal fired Power station, and when it closes West Burton coal fired Power Station. When they were first built this part of the Trent was known as 'Megawatt valley' With its built in infrastructure each site has the capacity to continue to supply the grid, the local community and Bassetlaw as it has done for the last 50 years. At the same time Bassetlaw becomes the champion of renewable energy with a realistic carbon neutral target and becoming self-sufficient in energy, future proofing the district's energy needs. It has been predicted our energy demands will triple over the next 50 years. By going into joint ventures with like minded enlightened partners, and with the local community figuratively and literally buying into the project our district could realistically achieve its ambition, in line with government targets, of 0 emissions in a very short time.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the District's housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. There are currently no plans for energy generation on the site.</p>
REF253	Fisher German	<p>The aspirations of the policy are supported however, as with the Garden Village, to ensure a sound allocation and Plan a robust review of the sites deliverability, including start dates, build out rates which has regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades, should be undertaken.</p>	<p>Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for similar projects in other areas of the country.</p>
REF257	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Part of the site lies in a flood zone. Note the commitment to undertake land raising to defend against floods. However, with climate change and increasing flooding, should we be building in this zone at all, or are there additional measures being considered, eg, the building of stilt houses.</p>	<p>A flood risk assessment will be a requirement of the scheme to ensure all appropriate flood mitigation measures are incorporated.</p>
REF258	Environment Agency	<p>With reference to bullet point b) under section 1, a development of this size presents the perfect opportunity to actually reduce the flood risks to the site and third parties. Like to see this requirement secured in the policy as it would help deliver the aspirations of strategic objective 12 in terms of reducing exposure to flood risk. With reference to bullet point b) under section 5, of the opinion that a development of this size should really be looking for opportunities to enhance the Cottam Wetlands local wildlife site rather than just mitigate any potential impacts.</p>	<p>A flood risk assessment will be a requirement of the scheme to ensure flood risk is managed and all appropriate flood mitigation measures are incorporated. The policy approach will be amended to secure necessary enhancements to the LWS.</p>
REF259	South Leverton Parish Council	<p>At recent meetings with the station management we had received assurances EDF had no plans to develop this site. The BDC proposal has now added another 450 houses in this locality over and above the new builds arising from local neighbourhood plans. The Cottam power station site development coupled with new builds arising from neighbourhood plans would have a major adverse impact on road traffic through a number of villages in the vicinity, and in particular South Leverton. The existing road infrastructure is inadequate for present levels of traffic in that all roads are of single carriageway structure with no effective means of controlling flow or speed through local communities. Traffic calming is an ongoing issue for all local parish councils. Have identified those villages which would be most affected, commencing a journey from Cottam power station site as illustrative of our concerns. Travelling to Lincoln, Tuxford, A1 South – Dunham, East Drayton Travelling to Retford, Gainsborough, M180 – Treswell, South Leverton, North Leverton, Sturton le Steeple. Consider the above communities as one cluster as BDC did in their previous draft plan.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
			which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF263	Resident	If half the traffic from the proposed housing development (450 now, with a further 1150 houses later) travels either south or east (and I would expect more than half because your planning Officer told us that Cottam residents gravitate towards Lincoln), the number of additional cars at the Ragnall Crossroads will be at least approx 450 cars: each house will have two cars because of the lack of public transport. This is set to rise to an additional 1150 in later years making a total of 1600 more cars using this poorly sighted crossroads. Traffic going south to the crossroads would pass our small village school which already struggles with speeding traffic and passing high heavy goods vehicles. Traffic wanting to travel in an easterly direction would use the small Dunham Bridge which would mean travelling through the village of Dunham with it's dangerous bend, already the site of numerous accidents due to traffic speed. Last month (January), an attending ambulance was hit by a car travelling too fast and unable to stop, one of many accidents in Dunham. Traffic travelling in a westerly direction would go through Darlton, one of two communities on the entire length of the A57 where the road actually divides the villages (Dunham being the other one), necessitating residents crossing the busy road on a regular basis, including school children catching the school bus and children crossing the A57 to access the play areas. This whole eastern side development of Bassetlaw impacts on our four parishes because of the increased traffic. As we live in a rural area we already have a high spring/summer/autumn high heavy goods traffic related to agriculture.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
1196914	Resident	cottam power station site would be better used for industrial use with traffic out via A57 dunham crossroads With West Burton also shortly stopping coal generating electricity, this would be a better site for housing as it is nearer better roads to major areas of employment.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	It is also acknowledged that the draft Local Plan promotes the reclamation and regeneration of the former Cottam Power Station for the delivery of a new Large Rural Settlement (Policy ST5). The Council does note that this site currently is in a remote location and there is no access across the Trent to Lincolnshire from here.	Thank you for your comments
REF278	Fisher German	Note that to ensure that this is a sound allocation, a robust review of the sites deliverability should be undertaken, including start dates, build out rates which has regard to infrastructure requirements/upgrades.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for similar projects in other areas of the country.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1197064	Resident	Land unsuitable for large scale development due to lack of infrastructure and polluted land.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. This includes education, health, sewerage, water etc. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF292	JVH Planning	We do not consider that the redevelopment of the Cottam Power Station is a sustainable Proposal. The site lies in an isolated area, and would not be a choice for development if it were not a brownfield site. It is not considered that the development timetable is realistic and that homes will be delivered in the timescales anticipated.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for similar projects in other areas of the country.
1197091	William Davis	The role that new settlements can provide is acknowledged in the NPPF (paragraph 72). However, the delivery of new settlements can be challenging and reliance on this site to deliver 450 dwellings from 2029 onwards may be optimistic. Evidence regarding the deliverability of the site is also unclear and the proposal is therefore not justified and the Local Plans is potentially not effective and therefore in breach of the tests of soundness. While the Site Selection Methodology 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 NPPF paragraphs 59 and 73 on developability) additional housing allocations should be made to provide a sufficient buffer and ensure that the housing requirement is met.	Housing delivery rates have been reviewed and amended where necessary based on evidence of delivery within the District and for similar projects in other areas of the country. The spatial strategy has been revised in response to updated evidence to ensure that the distribution of growth is proportionate to each settlement's place in the settlement hierarchy. This will create the flexibility needed to support a range of development of different types and sizes. It is important to support both towns and villages by delivering development appropriate to their needs that maintains and supports local services and facilities. In accordance with national policy a 5% buffer is used to ensure the housing requirement can be met.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF293	The Wildlife Trust	<p>The Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site (LWS 1/101) is within the eastern part of the site. 5.4.18 States that 'Development of the site will be sensitive to the Cottam Wetlands Local Wildlife Site. It will remain outside the developable area of the site ensuring its nature conservation interests are preserved during and post-construction. There are records of great crested newts at this site. Their breeding ponds and associated terrestrial habitat is fully protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 and are listed as a European Protected Species under Annex IV of the European Habitats Directive. The animals and their eggs, breeding sites and resting places are protected by law. It is clear therefore that there is a legal imperative to protect breeding ponds and the surrounding terrestrial habitat that is essential to their survival. It is not sufficient to just protect the LWS. Significant buffering to protect and enhance its wildlife value. The Policy also states: A full ecological survey will be required to ensure the qualities of the site are adequately considered, mitigated and compensated for.' An Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) will be required to assess the impacts this development will have on great crested newts before, during and after the planned work. Include qualitative and quantitative information. The mitigation hierarchy is pertinent to this proposal and included in the policy rather than the proposed wording. The four steps of the mitigation hierarchy — avoid, minimize, restore and offset are appropriate in this instance. Local Wildlife Sites are afforded protection through the NPPF due to their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into consideration the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats within a national, regional and local context, making them some of our most valuable urban and rural wildlife areas. Local authorities have a key role to play in the conservation of biodiversity and this is now formalised within Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Section 41 (S41) of the Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of habitats and species which are of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England. The list has been drawn up in consultation with Natural England, as required by the Act. The S41 list is used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies, including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under The Act. Development is a major contributing factor to the destruction of LWS. Any development of the site would need to consider and evaluate the open mosaic habitat on previously developed land (OMH) within the former power station site. This is a Habitat of Principal Importance under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Section 41 of The Act requires the Secretary of State to publish and maintain lists of species and types of habitats which are regarded by Natural England to be of "principal importance" for the purposes of conserving biodiversity in England.</p>	<p>The Council recognises its duty under legislation to protect habitats and species of principal importance. As such the policy will be amended to ensure appropriate protection is given to great crested newts and open mosaic habitats and that relevant assessments are put in place to identify and manage impacts.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
1197167	Resident	<p>As residents of Treswell disagree that the site, located adjacent to the River Trent, provides an opportunity to create a new settlement, initially 450 dwellings and then a further 1150 thereafter that will become a New Large Settlement. That would be more homes than in Treswell, Rampton and the Levertons and Sturton-le-Steeple collectively- we are told Tuxford has approx. 1600 homes. 1. The site is on a flood risk area. When Cottam Power Station was constructed the flood risk to the site and to habitable areas around the site was mitigated. However, residents of the village of Cottam who have recently responded to a 'call for sites' as part of a NDP review have been informed their site is unsuitable because of a flooding risk. The same flooding risk applies to the proposed Cottam Garden Community; there may be an inconsistency of application of guidance here and will mitigation be successful 2. Currently, there are few opportunities for employment, and for the planned early inhabitants of this CGC, there will be no school for their children, no health centre and many other services will be many miles away; environmentally unfriendly adding significantly to the community's carbon footprint. Note: 5.2.6 of DBLP states that settlements greater than 500 will be served by Primary School, Surgery, Community Hall, Store, Church/Public House- initially this proposed development will be 450 so will not qualify for these amenities. 3. The proposed development will significantly increase the traffic through the neighbouring villages of Treswell, South/North Leverton, Sturton-le-Steeple, Grove as the exit road from the proposed development is planned to meet Outgang Lane. These villages are already heavily congested by the 1000s of visitors to Sundown Adventureland and others travelling to their place of work to Rampton Hospital and other destinations at Retford, Worksop, Doncaster, Gainsborough, Newark, Lincoln and beyond; the transport infrastructure is unsuitable for the development of a new larger settlement. Exit from such a development, residential or light industry, should it happen, should be restricted to an exit at the Dunham crossroads. Alternative preferences :</p> <p>1. Return the site back to agriculture for the benefit of the communities and wider environment; protecting the wildlife and preserving the rural landscape would be a priority. 2. Provide opportunities for a range of different leisure activities e.g. Burton Waters, extend the cycle path to Torksey to join up with Saxilby-Lincoln- Skellingthorpe- Fledborough-Marnham, opportunities for the mooring of boats, create a park area with walks, big green space, and forestry area - but no more caravans/cabins 3. Many of our community members pre-date the Cottam Power Station, that was imposed upon them- the traffic, the physical towering structure, the noise and other levels of pollution, and so a clean renewable energy installation could be another option- but our older residents would not want to see, hear or smell such an installation! No waste convertors for us. Seems a natural progression to continue to provide energy of the green solar type; reduces the carbon footprint of our communities and ultimately to contribute positively to the climate change agenda 4. Consider the West Burton Site - to be close soon for a New Large Settlement. It has excellent connections (Bole corner roundabout) to the road network to Gainsborough, Retford, Doncaster, the Humber and beyond. This would be a more environmentally friendly, acceptable, sensible and safer solution for all the nearby communities and the new residents of a West Burton Garden Community.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are currently no plans to provide any of the submitted proposals on this site. West Burton is not identified for development in this Local Plan.</p>
REF299	Gladmans	<p>The policy sets out how the proposed re-development of the site will create a sustainable and high-quality living and working environment, and Gladman welcome the Council's ambition to regenerate a large brownfield site with a legacy of contamination. A fundamental element of the Plan is the remediation and regeneration of previously developed land in order to support the economic development of the District. Reiterate that Bevercotes Colliery should also be included within the Plan as a Priority Regeneration Area. As the Council is aware through on-going engagement and previous representations, land at Bevercotes Colliery predominantly comprises previously developed land thereby offering the sustainability advantages of turning previously developed land back into use – a key objective for the Council. The fact that the site has extant planning permission (09/05/00002) for employment demonstrates the principle of development in this location. Request that a further policy is added to the Plan which allocates Bevercotes Colliery as a Priority Regeneration Area and we would be happy to work with the Council in order to find the most effective policy wording for the Bevercotes Colliery Priority Regeneration Area.</p>	<p>The former Bevercotes Colliery is covered by Local Wildlife Sites and is identified by the Bassetlaw HRA as having the potential to host breeding and foraging protected bird species associated with the Sherwood Forest ppSPA. Allocating the site is therefore contrary to legislation and national planning policy. However, the site has planning permission for employment development which is considered to be deliverable as a mitigation package has previously been agreed.</p>
REF300 -	Natural England	<p>Welcome the policy aims of a landscape-led approach to design and the delivery of green and low carbon energy for this proposal. Welcome section 5 of the policy wording which offers protection to the Cottam Wetlands LWS and other ecological interest plus the provision of a multifunctional green infrastructure network. Suggest that reference</p>	<p>Reference to the improvement project has been made in the supporting text.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
		should also be made to the wider River Trent improvement projects (Trent Vision and Wild Trent) which are currently being developed.	
1197187	KSR Accountants	Renewable Energy Park alongside Wildlife area would be far more beneficial to the environment and the community	There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site.
1197238	Resident	There is a variance between the policy, and the impact of certain developments especially that at Cottam. The overall strategy is fine, but the council does not seem to have consider the impact of the proposed development at Leafield and at Cottam with the broad thrust of its other environmental policies. Proposing to build a mega village on and very near a flood plain, in an area with poor or no public transport, and poor road access. This will lead to pollution over and above that already experienced by residents in Cottam, Treswell and nearby villages.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF315	Resident	<p>Born in Rampton and lived here for the first 20 years of my life. My family always lived in the area and have now returned to this rural village for a quiet, peaceful life. This site was some of the best farmland in Britain and my family have farmed in Rampton and Laneham for generations. The Rampton and Woodbeck plan allows for a small amount of housing on the outskirts of the villages and this seems sensible but this planned estate of 1650 houses is a huge development with a poor road network and a lack of facilities or places for people to work. When the Cottam Power Station was built the promise was that if the power station was ever decommissioned it would be returned to its original state. This appears to be an empty promise. Cottam Power Station is now a brown field site and it has a high degree of contamination. It will be difficult to remove all the contaminants from the site and then build 1650 houses here. Would need to be extensive work to the road network and the road in and out of the power station. Know this is planned to be upgraded but the volume of traffic will be increased and would end up coming through all the small local villages to get to Outgang Road. The roads in these villages are full of parked cars and there are safety issues in North Leverton and up at the Rampton/Woodbeck crossroads. There would be approximately 6600 people living in the new houses and a minimum of 3300 car journeys twice a day. Because there is no work in the local area it would become a commuter town and the residents would be travelling through the local village network to get to their jobs in large towns. It makes sense to add additional houses to towns that already have good road networks, railway stations and community facilities than starting a whole new town in a rural area that is ill equipped. There is a lack of infrastructure and it could not support such a large housing project without a huge cost, not just to the developer, to Bassetlaw and council tax payers. Nor could the local community support the doubling of its population in such a small geographical area without it causing huge disruption locally and in the wider community. Dunham in the south to Sturton le Steeple in the north has only approximately 1600 houses. This housing project is proposing 1650 houses. Told there is no need for such a large amount housing. It flies in the face of the many wishing for a reduction to climate change. It is a beautiful area with extensive wetlands and nature reserve. Would like it to be a larger nature reserve for all of the community with cycle ways and paths by the river. The wildlife and bird life is extensive and the addition of 1600 houses would impinge on the natural environment. It could be a fantastic attraction and set aside for re-wilding. It makes more sense to keep the nature areas that exist and continue to generate power on the Cottam site but generate clean power eg solar or wind farm. With its existing infrastructure has the capacity to continue to supply the grid, the local community and Bassetlaw as it has done for the last 50 years. At the same time Bassetlaw becomes the champion of renewable energy. The area near the river floods extensively and recently the River Trent reached 6.36m at 8.30pm on the 20th February 2020. The flood information service states that flooding is possible when it reaches 4.65m so it has been a lot higher than this and for a very long period of time. Its highest recorded level in recent years was 7.31m, on Friday 10th November 2000 at 12:00pm. It being higher in 1947 and 1963 when Torksey Street and Rampton were flooded. With global warming and rises in sea level this tidal river will continue to rise in level and flooding will be a regular occurrence. The new housing would need flood proofing and reassurances that residents would be able to insure their homes. Would like a greener solution for the enjoyment of all in Bassetlaw and surrounds.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF318	Resident	<p>Husband Born in Rampton and lived here for the first 20 years of my life. My family always lived in the area and have now returned to this rural village for a quiet, peaceful life. This site was some of the best farmland in Britain and my family have farmed in Rampton and Laneham for generations. The Rampton and Woodbeck plan allows for a small amount of housing on the outskirts of the villages and this seems sensible but this planned estate of 1650 houses is a huge development with a poor road network and a lack of facilities or places for people to work. When the Cottam Power Station was built the promise was that if the power station was ever decommissioned it would be returned to its original state. This appears to be an empty promise. Cottam Power Station is now a brown field site and it has a high degree of contamination. It will be difficult to remove all the contaminants from the site and then build 1650 houses here. Would need to be extensive work to the road network and the road in and out of the power station. Know this is planned to be upgraded but the volume of traffic will be increased and would end up coming through all the small local villages to get to Outgang Road. The roads in these villages are full of parked cars and there are safety issues in North Leverton and up at the Rampton/Woodbeck crossroads. There would be approximately 6600 people living in the new houses and a minimum of 3300 car journeys twice a day. Because there is no work in the local area it would become a commuter town and the residents would be travelling through the local village network to get to their jobs in large towns. It makes sense to add additional houses to towns that already have good road networks, railway stations and community facilities than starting a whole new town in a rural area that is ill equipped. There is a lack of infrastructure and it could not support such a large housing project without a huge cost, not just to the developer, to Bassetlaw and council tax payers. Nor could the local community support the doubling of its population in such a small geographical area without it causing huge disruption locally and in the wider community. Dunham in the south to Sturton le Steeple in the north has only approximately 1600 houses. This housing project is proposing 1650 houses. Told there is no need for such a large amount housing. It flies in the face of the many wishing for a reduction to climate change. It is a beautiful area with extensive wetlands and nature reserve. Would like it to be a larger nature reserve for all of the community with cycle ways and paths by the river. The wildlife and bird life is extensive and the addition of 1600 houses would impinge on the natural environment. It could be a fantastic attraction and set aside for re-wilding. It makes more sense to keep the nature areas that exist and continue to generate power on the Cottam site but generate clean power eg solar or wind farm. With its existing infrastructure has the capacity to continue to supply the grid, the local community and Bassetlaw as it has done for the last 50 years. At the same time Bassetlaw becomes the champion of renewable energy. The area near the river floods extensively and recently the River Trent reached 6.36m at 8.30pm on the 20th February 2020. The flood information service states that flooding is possible when it reaches 4.65m so it has been a lot higher than this and for a very long period of time. Its highest recorded level in recent years was 7.31m, on Friday 10th November 2000 at 12:00pm. It being higher in 1947 and 1963 when Torksey Street and Rampton were flooded. With global warming and rises in sea level this tidal river will continue to rise in level and flooding will be a regular occurrence. The new housing would need flood proofing and reassurances that residents would be able to insure their homes. Would like a greener solution for the enjoyment of all in Bassetlaw and surrounds.</p>	There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site.
REF345	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	<p>Cottam Power station re purpose don't re develop it is greener and offers opportunities for quick wins on our green agenda. To this end we should be talking to Lobby groups and journalists who specialise in waste to energy issues. Solar Panels we should be driving an expected minimum in the district of say no less than 1MW per hectare and offering benefits etc. for those companies who will come and produce more per hectare.</p>	There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF354	Sutton-on-Trent Parish Council	Main concern at this time is the potential for a significant increase in the volumes of traffic travelling through Sutton on Trent from the direction of Grassthorpe, Fledborough and beyond. In relation to the site of the former Cottam Power Station, the long-term plan states for the area to become a 'Large Rural Settlement' of mixed use with the capacity for 450 dwellings, with the potential for a further 1,150 along with contributions to education, shops, health care and community facilities. The Parish Council has concerns that the additional traffic that such a settlement would generate would not be accommodated by the existing road network and in particular the A57 route to the A1 north and south bound at Markham Moor. It is believed that high levels of vehicles would use the unclassified road from the A57 through Fledborough, Grassthorpe and Sutton on Trent to access the A1 south bound at Carlton on Trent as is currently the case with much traffic. Clause 5.4.20 states 'Given its long-term former use, there is a significant programme of demolition, site clearance and remediation required in the first instance. This is expected to take at least five years.' It is also a concern that during the anticipated prolonged demolition and building programmes that would be necessary, the same journey from the A1 would be completed by large vehicles for which the road is totally unsuited.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, the natural environment, flood risk and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.
REF356	Grassthorpe Parish Meeting	Re-use of the Cottam Power Station site. The proposed new village on this site will generate more traffic on the road through our village by people accessing the A1 southbound and Newark. The quoted 5 year regeneration window will also cause an increase in HGV traffic accessing the site through our village unless a designated access route for this phase is put in place.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>Been justified by planners and the Cottam Station owners who have a financial interest in obtaining residential planning permission. It is obvious that a residential development is not appropriate and a village centre is a planners fantasy not a practical suggestion. The boundary of the brownfield site has been extended beyond the existing brownfield land but a large area of agricultural land west of Cottam and another larger area directly East of Rampton village, leading East, and adjoining to the existing power station site. The agricultural land here is of high quality and should remain as is. It may be sensible on the existing brown land to allow light industry and commercial land for local businesses and to supply local residents with jobs. The site is totally unsuitable for housing and the incoming population that would come with it. It is as far from a main road as can be in Bassetlaw. Putting a population in the middle of nowhere, rather than a community that has grown naturally is likely to lead to dependency and possible deprivation. Cottam is a hamlet lying to the North of this site. A single track road runs through Cottam, and the villages of Leverton can be accessed through Cottam village, but this is undesirable for the safety of those residents. The route West would go through the village of Treswell, alternatively traffic transferring North would go through the T junction at Treswell, often congested and not a good turn to continue North through the villages of South then North Leverton. Before negotiating the built up village of Sturton and to the Bole roundabout on an A road. A 71/2 mile journey to the main road at Bole corner. The route South can be accessed 2 miles from the Power station site at a T junction before entering the village of Treswell. The road was altered and improved to take heavy traffic during building and maintenance of the station. Any industrial and commercial traffic would need to be restricted to this access route which intersects the A57 Markham Moor to Lincoln main road. The distance is 6 ¾ miles to the A57 junction at Dunham Crossroads. Dunham on Trent primary school lies on this road just 200 yards from the A57 junction. Residential traffic from any development on the station site cannot be. Along this designated route lies the Woodbeck Rampton crossroads. This is a death trap because many people have died over the years. The communities have asked for improvements, but NCC not willing to spend any money. A roundabout may be the solution. The dangerous crossroads is another reason why Cottam and an increase in residential traffic should be avoided. The route North travels through North Leverton. There is a dangerous crossroads in the centre of the village. There is much concern with the crossroads as the increases in housing imposed are already envisaged to increase the congestion and the danger there. There is a campaign by the community to improve the crossroads, but officers are advising solutions will not alleviate the dangers, and money cannot be spent without improving safety. Less traffic would be welcome.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
REF361	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council and Notts CC	<p>No residential at Cottam would be safer. It would be unsustainable, environmentally unfriendly, and dangerous for the residents of the roads leading from the station and in the villages through which the unrestricted residential traffic would have to pass. Most of the routes connecting Cottam are country roads grown and tarmacked. They do not lend themselves to improvement even if the finance was possible. It is ludicrous to suggest a wasteful expense of creating a village centre for surrounding villages-in what is the edge of nowhere with a river which floods to the East. Many of the residents own their own cars along the Trentside already. The bus service already travels along the Dunham North Leverton route without entering many of the villages. Passengers must contact the bus company in an on demand request service. Not many passengers use it but it is valued by those who do, and is an economical way of continuing to provide public transport. It will be salutary to learn that the Council's suggested transport hub will be a bus stop sign with a shelter on a dead end. Bassetlaw do not provide the bus services and the planners have clearly not researched this. The existing garden villages along the Trent side have to be self reliant. There is deprivation of facilities along the Trentside, as the Council splash the cash in the West and North, the villages throughout Bassetlaw have long been neglected. Cottam is as far from major medical facilities as can be in Bassetlaw. There is a small surgery in North Leverton but it would be at least 35 minutes to Bassetlaw hospital. Medical Facilities in Lincolnshire would take even longer. There is adequate brown field land at Cottam, and it does not make sense to use valuable agricultural land where there is little demand for housing and industrial demand, because of the poor transport and road links. West Burton Power site be substituted for Cottam. Closing shortly It is only one mile North to an A class road at Bole corner, and this short distance does not intrude in any villages. Access is safe and efficient with good roads to Gainsborough, Retford, Doncaster, Sheffield and the North.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are no proposals for development at West Burton in this Local Plan.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF362	Treswell and Cottam Parish Council	<p>The Treswell with Cottam Parish Council, and the NDP Steering Group, are disappointed that EDF have said no form of renewable energy is viable for the site. Perhaps without the possibility of the housing development, there may be a viable way to introduce a form of renewable energy production on this site; a solution, as you will see from the responses, is overwhelmingly favoured by this community. This community does not consider that the development of a Cottam Garden Community represents best use, although they do understand that it represents highest value for both the current site owners and the District Council. This community fear that many questions remain unanswered, and that the housing development proposed is unnecessary, unsustainable, and unaffordable, and that the proposed Cottam Garden Community should not be included within the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020 for a number of reasons: 1. Our medical facilities for doctors and schools are at capacity. Ensuring that these facilities are in place for first phase occupation is critical. Bassetlaw state that these facilities are not available for first phase developments, and for communities less than 500 units. 2. Conservation of existing wildlife facilities currently occupying the whole of Cottam Power Station site is critical 3. Confirmation as to who is responsible for the maintenance of flood defence system around the development site, and wider reach to protect existing communities and residents, is required 4. A full, and thorough, traffic study to be carried out on the country roads to identify, and to develop further, one-way systems through neighbouring villages to safeguard existing residents and road users and support new, improved highway infrastructure is vital 5. New road infrastructure will be essential to join up the new Garden Community to the A57 running alongside the River Trent to alleviate heavy road use on the country roads/lanes around the site. This new infrastructure would need to be complete before any work starts on the site development 6. Re-consideration to be given to assist Cottam parishioners who wish to develop their sites, who have been refused due to potential flooding issues to be included in a future Draft Local Plan-inconsistencies 7. Improved routes for walking/biking to join up new Garden Community to nearby local communities should be part of the planned, infrastructure provided by the developer to encourage/secure, social integration, community cohesion and retain/increase revenue with existing shops/pubs etc 8. Development on other decommissioned coal fired power stations may have been successful but these have been developed adjacent to existing facilities such as major roads, employment, schools, doctors etc. To be successful, and sustainable, these facilities need to be installed, on site, prior to the occupation of a housing development 9. The District Council have a responsibility to ensure the health and wellbeing of all residents. The fear is, that this unsustainable, unnecessary development, may become forgotten and a blight, rather than something to be championed. Careful thought and consideration need to be given to the regeneration of the site, and preferably, NOT the option that gives the best return.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must ensure there is enough land to meet the Districts housing needs for the next 17 years or so. The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are currently no plans for energy production on this site.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF362 -	Treswell and Cottam Parish Council	<p>Below are alternative suggestions made by residents who attended a consultation meeting at Treswell Village Hall on 20th February. 1. Return the site to agricultural land for the benefit of all communities and wider environment 2. The development of a Renewable Energy Park alongside the non-negotiable Wildlife Area 3. An area providing the opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity 4. Development of Cottam Garden Community 450-1600 dwellings and associated commercial, industrial and amenities (Surgery, Pr. School, Shop, Church, Public House) 5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 1. Prefer that the land to become agricultural or extended wildlife area with riverside walks or a renewable energy park. 2. Should take this opportunity to retrieve what was lost to build this power station initially. 3. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond. 4. Cottam Power Station site is surrounded by farm land, should be returned to agricultural and returned to the community as first planned. 5. When this land was compulsorily purchased to build the Power Station, the original plan was to return the land to the community when it was no longer required for energy production. The land floods and so is unsuitable for homes. 6. To allow wildlife to re-inhabit the area for future generations. Development of 450-1600 homes would increase vehicle movements on our minor roads and increase noise and pollution. 7. Returning the land to agricultural would benefit everyone. Land for agricultural purposes needs to be conserved for future generations and not for ourselves. 8. Returning to agriculture and extending the adjoining wildlife area would provide a natural defence from flooding. 9. It should go back to how it used to be- agriculture and woodland. We do not need any dwellings. Let the planners have them on their doorstep- see how they like it! 10. Should be turned back to agriculture. Strongly opposed about houses being built in Cottam. Who wants houses? - You have them... Cottam don't want any. 11. A farming community and we need to support local farming and local industry 12. Keep the land to be used for agriculture. Good for the environment and community. 13. Good to return to agriculture; but land is historically heavily contaminated 14. Prefer that the land is returned to agriculture but a renewable energy park would benefit and protect the wildlife - as an acceptable alternative. 15. This site was stolen from the local farmers, and the community, by compulsory purchase order to produce electricity for the nation- time to restore it to agriculture- give it back. 16. Would prefer the planting of hardwood trees and return the land back to original owners. People who live in the country side need to support countryside, ways and activities. Importing of families from less rural locations often creates challenges for both them and existing village dwellers. Town and countryside often don't mix. Return the land to agriculture- leave it for the sheep! 17. Returning the brownfield site to agricultural land will be better for the environment and the local community. 19. After 50 years and more, the land being used as it has, has made lots of money for the generating companies. It would be an act of great generosity for the site to be returned to agriculture as this area is rural and full of wildlife that needs our continued support to survive and thrive. 20. There is insufficient agricultural land here, in question to be economical for that purpose</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. There are currently no plans for energy production on this site or to return the site to agricultural use.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF362	Treswell and Cottam Parish Council	<p>The development of a Renewable Energy Park alongside the non-negotiable Wildlife Area Reason: 1.Site has been producing energy for the nation for many years, still connected to national grid. This would also provide some employment opportunities for families in the community. 2. Renewable Energy Park, Solar or low height turbines, would give benefit to local community and environment, whilst maintaining and developing the non-negotiable wildlife area. Although the renewable energy park may not be viable for EDF, it may be for other developers/energy producers. 3.It has all the infrastructure for electrical generation and if we are changing from fossil fuels for road vehicles then there will be a much greater demand for electricity. Solar Panels and wind turbines are the obvious choice, but I believe that there should be energy storage systems for periods when there is no wind and no sunshine. This will also create jobs for local people. 4.The development of a Renewable Energy Park is more in keeping with the original site usage, keeping local road usage to existing levels. 5. With a history of generating electricity, I believe this should be a solar farm supplying green energy to the local community. 6. This toxic site is not suitable for domestic use. Wind turbines, Solar Power, or a gas station preferred. Demolition rubble should be taken by barge and used for coastal defence. 7.Renewable Energy Park preferred. No noise from Solar Panels, minimal noise from wind driven generators. Minimal traffic increase. 8. The infrastructure is in place to divert Renewable Energy into the grid. The existing gas station is remaining and will be ideal for that purpose. This would also help to look after the large variety of wildlife in the area instead of destroying it by building on the land. 9. A renewable Energy Park would assist in reducing the carbon footprint for the area. It would also not result in any increase in traffic through the surrounding villages in particular, Cottam, which already has to endure HGVs travelling through to Coates damaging property due to vibration and damage to roads/verges would be kept to a minimum. 10. Generating energy from a renewable source reduces air pollution- good for the environment. Diversifying energy supply reduces our dependence on imported fuels. The manufacture and installation of renewable energy equipment and installation would create jobs for the local community 11. In the present crisis of climate change, I feel this is the best way forward. 12. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity to develop it locally. 13. The infrastructure is already in place, residents in the area are well used to a large Power Station so it would be a natural progression moving forward to creating a clean energy producing site. 14. Grid already for joining to Solar Panels and Wind Turbines. 15. The site is ideal for Renewable Energy Park. We need to protect wildlife areas. 16. I would prefer that the land is returned to agriculture but a renewable energy park would benefit and protect the wildlife. 17. Green energy production-Infrastructure already in place- grid. Clean, no additional traffic/population good for carbon footprint. 18. After 50 years of being a part of the landscape to provide energy it is the natural progression to carry on with a renewable energy source within the area. 19. Low maintenance REF preferred; less traffic, already on the national grid. Greener future protects and saves the wildlife and does not impact on current infrastructure as the building of many unnecessary homes. 20. Site is already on the national grid. Low maintenance, low traffic, protects established wildlife. 21. We need to provide for and protect our wildlife. A Renewable Energy Park and Wildlife Area could work very well together.22.We currently need more Green Energy and this site is perfect for this; there would be no increase in traffic on our narrow, single, track roads.23. A Renewable Energy Park is preferable; to reduce carbon footprint, and contribute to reaching green carbon targets and address climate change, natural link at Cottam to National Grid.24. Hundreds of turbines not acceptable25. No to Renewable Energy Park- yes to extending the Wildlife area to whole brown field site26. Giving some of the site to Renewable Energy Generation is the only alternative and it would create job opportunities.27. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity and location in which to develop it locally.28. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station- don't want any more.29. With more information we would probably prefer an extended wildlife area with riverside walks or a renewable energy park.30. Retention and continued support of wildlife, currently occupying this site, is critical for this location3. An area providing the opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity Reason:1.There is enough leisure/camping in this area. We need to promote nature, walking and cycling.2. It would be nice to have leisure amenities for the benefit of local villages3. Infrastructure- road for access unsuitable for additional visiting traffic- no.4. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and</p>	There are currently no proposals for energy generation for this site or to return the site to agricultural use. The Local Wildlife Site and habitats and species on site will be appropriately protected through any future proposals.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 -	Cottam Priority	Regeneration Area	
		<p>nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to eventually provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond- it goes as far as Woodhall Spa and beyond.5. No camping - Perhaps include the Forestry Commission, National Trust or other association in the development of this brownfield site.6. This site has a prime riverside location and is suitable for a number of healthy leisure activities; water sports, moorings, marina, riverside walks, joining up to national cycle tracks- but no camping please7. Site turned into a Learning Centre for future generations eg MAGNA – it is a shame that the Control Centre is to be on display elsewhere – future development and Sundown represents joined up thinking1.DEFINITELY NOT This area is rural and does not have the capacity/facilities for this. Additional traffic associated with such a development would be detrimental to all existing residents, traffic management and necessary road repair/infrastructure. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town2. Our concern is that up to 1600 homes would relate to infrastructure challenges; roads, flooding, and where would all these residents work? There is little opportunity for employment.3. Concerns over this proposal. There is few opportunities for employment- where would the occupiers work? The local infrastructure would be unable to cope with large scale demands. A significantly smaller development may be more appropriate for this rural area and only if it was in combination with a wildlife protected area (Support?)4. A maximum of 450 dwellings with all the appropriate amenities- school, medical services, community hall, church, public house, store- as described in the Draft Local Plan, would be acceptable (Support?)5. We are really opposed to more houses. They are not needed or suitable for land that floods. An extra 2 cars per household would add pressure to the already busy roads. Carbon footprint, climate change?6.We feel that housing in this area is needed and if that brings more amenities to the area then it would be an advantage. Also, it would bring the housing to an existing brownfield area and take proposed housing pressure off the villages in this area. (Support?)7.Too much development would ruin the rural nature of this area. To create a balanced addition to Cottam and to other nuclear villages any development should be no bigger than 50 dwellings. (Support?)8. Existing communities could not cope with all the additional traffic; medical services etc are already stretched to limit.9. There is no infrastructure for the housing that is not needed (Retford housing stock is adequate?)10. Lack of infrastructure does not support building of 1600 houses and related construction, nor is this necessary- housing stock for Retford is at least adequate.11. The area floods and is not suitable for housing and there is insufficient infrastructure to support.12. Site not suitable for housing. Flood plain and contaminated ground, asbestos, oil etc. Already enough daily traffic through the village due to Rampton staff. Roads in a terrible state and enough housing in Retford already.13. Housing would produce too much traffic, would need new roads in and out of new community and a regular public transport service reintroduced14. 1600 homes vastly increase carbon footprint; 2 vehicles per home, inadequate local transport- where is this new community to work? Few opportunities for employment locally.15. This would lead to traffic disruption, location - distant from supporting services and road infrastructure totally inadequate- totally the wrong place for housing development. Where are occupants going to work?16. I would support a selection of retirement bungalows and council dwellings that would help Cottam and the surrounding villages in many ways to develop a supportive community.17. The building of homes for me is preferable but I would need to know that the amenities- school, medical facilities, shops etc were to be planned to serve the early inhabitants of such a development.18. I would support some development in Cottam- but not in front of Floss Lane. The village needs more recognition to bring the community and its people together.19. Lack of infrastructure does not support the building of 1600 houses and related construction- nor is it necessary in Retford according to the numbers in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.20. Infrastructure not suitable for this.21. Community medical facilities and schools are at capacity- additional facilities would not be made available to early occupants of this development22. Extensive, possibly unaffordable improvements to road infrastructure required to safely join up to local communities- before any development begins- to keep the communities and current highway users safe.23. BDC have a responsibility to ensure health and wellbeing of all residents and if this goes ahead, I fear that this development's unsustainability will render the proposed Cottam Garden Community a blight, rather than something to be championed.5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 1.This combination is preferable. But- we have ample Leisure facilities for our community. We wish to</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 -	Cottam Priority	Regeneration Area	
		<p>remain rural and not be a part of a large town.2. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town. No leisure facilities eg camping – just walking, cycling tracks etc. Get the nation active.3. This option would fit into the existing local environment and benefit the local community rather than having a huge impact on it. It would make the area more attractive to families who wished to relocate into the existing Trent Villages.4. This is possibly the best solution for all in the surrounding area, but the number of homes should be kept to a minimum and should complement the character of the existing dwellings in Cottam and the surrounding villages5. Infrastructure inadequate to serve such development6. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station - don't want any more.7. Additional, improved walking/cycle routes to join up nearby communities- community cohesion8. Developer to provide new playpark facilities and easy access foot/cycler paths from nearby communities.2. The development of a Renewable Energy Park alongside the non-negotiable Wildlife Area</p> <p>Reason:1.Site has been producing energy for the nation for many years, still connected to national grid. This would also provide some employment opportunities for families in the community.2. Renewable Energy Park, Solar or low height turbines, would give benefit to local community and environment, whilst maintaining and developing the non-negotiable wildlife area. Although the renewable energy park may not be viable for EDF, it may be for other developers/energy producers.3.It has all the infrastructure for electrical generation and if we are changing from fossil fuels for road vehicles then there will be a much greater demand for electricity. Solar Panels and wind turbines are the obvious choice, but I believe that there should be energy storage systems for periods when there is no wind and no sunshine. This will also create jobs for local people.4.The development of a Renewable Energy Park is more in keeping with the original site usage, keeping local road usage to existing levels.5. With a history of generating electricity, I believe this should be a solar farm supplying green energy to the local community.6. This toxic site is not suitable for domestic use. Wind turbines, Solar Power, or a gas station preferred.Demolition rubble should be taken by barge and used for coastal defence.7.Renewable Energy Park preferred. No noise from Solar Panels, minimal noise from wind driven generators. Minimal traffic increase.8. The infrastructure is in place to divert Renewable Energy into the grid. The existing gas station is remaining and will be ideal for that purpose. This would also help to look after the large variety of wildlife in the area instead of destroying it by building on the land.9. A renewable Energy Park would assist in reducing the carbon footprint for the area. It would also not result in any increase in traffic through the surrounding villages in particular, Cottam, which already has to endure HGVs travelling through to Coates damaging property due to vibration and damage to roads/verges would be kept to a minimum.10. Generating energy from a renewable source reduces air pollution- good for the environment. Diversifying energy supply reduces our dependence on imported fuels. The manufacture and installation of renewable energy equipment and installation would create jobs for the local community11. In the present crisis of climate change, I feel this is the best way forward.12. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity to develop it locally. 13. The infrastructure is already in place, residents in the area are well used to a large Power Station so it would be a natural progression moving forward to creating a clean energy producing site.14. Grid already for joining to Solar Panels and Wind Turbines. 15. The site is ideal for Renewable Energy Park. We need to protect wildlife areas. 16. I would prefer that the land is returned to agriculture but a renewable energy park would benefit and protect the wildlife.17. Green energy production-Infrastructure already in place- grid. Clean, no additional traffic/population good for carbon footprint. 18. After 50 years of being a part of the landscape to provide energy it is the natural progression to carry on with a renewable energy source within the area.19. Low maintenance REF preferred; less traffic, already on the national grid. Greener future protects and saves the wildlife and does not impact on current infrastructure as the building of many unnecessary homes.20. Site is already on the national grid. Low maintenance, low traffic, protects established wildlife.21. We need to provide for and protect our wildlife. A Renewable Energy Park and Wildlife Area could work very well together.22.We currently need more Green Energy and this site is perfect for this; there would be no increase in traffic on our narrow, single, track roads.23. A Renewable Energy Park is preferable; to reduce carbon footprint, and contribute to reaching green carbon targets and address climate change, natural link at Cottam to National Grid.24. Hundreds of turbines not acceptable25. No to Renewable Energy Park- yes to extending the Wildlife area to whole brown field site26. Giving some of the site to</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 -	Cottam Priority	Regeneration Area	
		<p>Renewable Energy Generation is the only alternative and it would create job opportunities.27. Preserving the rural landscape is important, and renewable energy is essential for the future- this is an ideal opportunity and location in which to develop it locally.28. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station- don't want any more.29. With more information we would probably prefer an extended wildlife area with riverside walks or a renewable energy park.30. Retention and continued support of wildlife, currently occupying this site, is critical for this location3. An area providing the opportunity for a combination of different types of Leisure Activity Reason:1. There is enough leisure/camping in this area. We need to promote nature, walking and cycling.2. It would be nice to have leisure amenities for the benefit of local villages3. Infrastructure- road for access unsuitable for additional visiting traffic- no.4. Create an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the countryside and nation; the natural wildlife area should be extended to eventually provide a forest, with walks. Cycle tracks should extend over the recently built bridge to Torksey and then beyond along the Fosse to Saxilby and Lincoln and beyond- it goes as far as Woodhall Spa and beyond.5. No camping - Perhaps include the Forestry Commission, National Trust or other association in the development of this brownfield site.6. This site has a prime riverside location and is suitable for a number of healthy leisure activities; water sports, moorings, marina, riverside walks, joining up to national cycle tracks- but no camping please7. Site turned into a Learning Centre for future generations eg MAGNA – it is a shame that the Control Centre is to be on display elsewhere – future development and Sundown represents joined up thinking1.DEFINITELY NOT This area is rural and does not have the capacity/facilities for this. Additional traffic associated with such a development would be detrimental to all existing residents, traffic management and necessary road repair/infrastructure. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town2. Our concern is that up to 1600 homes would relate to infrastructure challenges; roads, flooding, and where would all these residents work? There is little opportunity for employment.3. Concerns over this proposal. There are few opportunities for employment- where would the occupiers work? The local infrastructure would be unable to cope with large scale demands. A significantly smaller development may be more appropriate for this rural area and only if it was in combination with a wildlife protected area (Support?)4. A maximum of 450 dwellings with all the appropriate amenities- school, medical services, community hall, church, public house, store- as described in the Draft Local Plan, would be acceptable (Support?)5. We are really opposed to more houses. They are not needed or suitable for land that floods. An extra 2 cars per household would add pressure to the already busy roads. Carbon footprint, climate change?6. We feel that housing in this area is needed and if that brings more amenities to the area then it would be an advantage. Also, it would bring the housing to an existing brownfield area and take proposed housing pressure off the villages in this area. (Support?)7. Too much development would ruin the rural nature of this area. To create a balanced addition to Cottam and to other nuclear villages any development should be no bigger than 50 dwellings. (Support?)8. Existing communities could not cope with all the additional traffic; medical services etc are already stretched to limit.9. There is no infrastructure for the housing that is not needed (Retford housing stock is adequate?)10. Lack of infrastructure does not support building of 1600 houses and related construction, nor is this necessary- housing stock for Retford is at least adequate.11. The area floods and is not suitable for housing and there is insufficient infrastructure to support.12. Site not suitable for housing. Flood plain and contaminated ground, asbestos, oil etc. Already enough daily traffic through the village due to Rampton staff. Roads in a terrible state and enough housing in Retford already.13. Housing would produce too much traffic, would need new roads in and out of new community and a regular public transport service reintroduced14. 1600 homes vastly increase carbon footprint; 2 vehicles per home, inadequate local transport- where is this new community to work? Few opportunities for employment locally.15. This would lead to traffic disruption, location - distant from supporting services and road infrastructure totally inadequate- totally the wrong place for housing development. Where are occupants going to work?16. I would support a selection of retirement bungalows and council dwellings that would help Cottam and the surrounding villages in many ways to develop a supportive community.17. The building of homes for me is preferable but I would need to know that the amenities- school, medical facilities, shops etc were to be planned to serve the early inhabitants of such a development.18. I would support some development in Cottam- but not in front of Floss Lane. The village needs more recognition to bring the community and its people together.19. Lack of infrastructure</p>	

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
		<p>does not support the building of 1600 houses and related construction- nor is it necessary in Retford according to the numbers in the Draft Bassetlaw Local Plan.20. Infrastructure not suitable for this.21. Community medical facilities and schools are at capacity- additional facilities would not be made available to early occupants of this development22. Extensive, possibly unaffordable improvements to road infrastructure required to safely join up to local communities- before any development begins- to keep the communities and current highway users safe.23. BDC have a responsibility to ensure health and wellbeing of all residents and if this goes ahead, I fear that this development's unsustainability will render the proposed Cottam Garden Community a blight, rather than something to be championed.5. A combination of the non-negotiable Wildlife Area, renewable energy installation, leisure and housing development 1.This combination is preferable. But- we have ample Leisure facilities for our community. We wish to remain rural and not be a part of a large town.2. Remain rural; rural living is why we chose to move out of town. No leisure facilities eg camping – just walking, cycling tracks etc. Get the nation active.3. This option would fit into the existing local environment and benefit the local community rather than having a huge impact on it. It would make the area more attractive to families who wished to relocate into the existing Trent Villages.4. This is possibly the best solution for all in the surrounding area, but the number of homes should be kept to a minimum and should complement the character of the existing dwellings in Cottam and the surrounding villages5. Infrastructure inadequate to serve such development6. Definitely no Renewable Energy installation needed; already got the Gas Station - don't want any more.7, Additional, improved walking/cycle routes to join up nearby communities- community cohesion8. Developer to provide new playpark facilities and easy access foot/cyclers paths from nearby communities.</p>	
REF363	Resident	<p>The plan to develop 450 houses on the Cottam Power Station in this plan period whilst maybe admirable it is in my submission not feasible. Cannot see any developer wishing to fund the infrastructure improvements required. The building of a school, community facility, shop and road improvement would make it unprofitable. If all these improvements were not provided in the early stages the impact on the surrounding roads would be intolerable.</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.</p>
REF368	National Grid	Asset map provided	Assets noted.
REF386	Resident	<p>Endorse developing brown rather than green field sites Cottam is for too isolated a rural area which is hemmed into the east by the River Trent – a river very prone to flooding. The transport links are virtually non-existent and the current roads are narrow. To cater for 400-500 new homes would be bad enough. The planned large increase later on would be unjust unless all roads are widened and unsustainable and the road bridge created over into Lincolnshire. Fear for wildlife in the wetland areas. No amount of improvement to allow greater public access could enhance this wildlife habitat. The thought of hundreds of people gaining access and thus improving their health does not add up. Wildlife is not improved by mass human intervention for the purposes of leisure. Support therefore a small scale regeneration project with 400 a maximum figure and it would be excellent if the old railway line could become a passenger line to link to west and east. Support any schemes that are sustainable and which address climate change but implore the Council to do more pro-active work in addressing the big roadside litter problems currently faced in the countryside. An extra few hundred people seems to equal more anti-social behaviour/ littering. Has any thought been given to this very real problem and how it can be solved?</p>	<p>The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Wildlife Site and habitats and species on site will be appropriately protected through any future proposals. Options to investigate the re-opening of the railway line for passenger rail should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.</p>

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST05 - Cottam Priority Regeneration Area			
REF401	East Markham Parish Council	Cottam regeneration scheme represents a disproportionate spend on the site for little in the way of benefit. It is difficult to see this representing an attractive site for either developers or residents. Also difficult to see either Cottam or High Marnham being attractive to business. Each site is remote and has poor transport links. The funds proposed for each of these two sites would be better-used improving infrastructure elsewhere within the district.	Future development at Cottam would be developer led. Therefore any infrastructure provided or improved would be as a result of development at Cottam. The Council is not committing any funds to the regeneration of Cottam.
REF475	Resident	ST5 – very costly conversion of site, lots of local improvements required.	Thank you for your comments
REF480	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Taken at face value BDCs statement that the site at Cottam is viable for housing. Been contacted by several local residents who state (after working at the location) otherwise. Due to the current information provided cannot support the proposal at Cottam. When completed the town will be larger than Bawtry and have no additional guaranteed Transport Infrastructure. The impact on local communities will be immense. Question how environmentally sound the proposal is in relation to other areas. Can only see the main employment hubs being in Sheffield, Worksop and Lincoln which all would involve residents using personal cars to commute. Concerned that the plan can not clarify at this stage where additional school places and medical support services would be located. Concerned with the impact on already overstrained local amenities. The community suggestion of a renewable energy park needs to be explored at depth. With the governments (and as far as I am aware all major parties) commitment to a carbon neutral economy by 2050 it seems short sighted to lose such a strategic site that could benefit all the residents of Bassetlaw and the UK.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise. The proposal included employment land on site. Infrastructure provision for any site develops alongside the production of the Plan through negotiations with infrastructure partners so that it can be tailored to meet the developments needs.
REF484	North Notts and Lincs Community Rail Partnership	It is noted that the existing railway to the site is protected. Provision for suitable mode of transport across the Trent using the Sustains route to Torksey (for bus connections to Lincoln and Gainsborough) should be considered for those unable or unwilling to walk or cycle. It is a distance of 1.5 miles.	Options to improving the Trent crossing should be explored by the site promoters to determine whether it is a feasible alternative to the car.
REF491	Stone Planning Services	This is a relatively isolated site served off a series of minor roads which is allocated to serve 1,600 dwellings and 14.4 ha of B1, B2 and B8 employment. Do not consider this to be a commercially attractive site to employment investors or a sustainable location. The site as originally developed as a power station because of the proximity of the River Trent and rail infrastructure and its relative isolation from residential areas; these are bespoke locational criteria and not sustainable criteria for a mixed use residential and employment allocation. Notwithstanding the existing river defences the site is partially in Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, a Flood Risk Assessment has not been undertaken to determine if the site is suitable for housing, a particularly vulnerable use, and employment. Resolving flood issues is a prerequisite to allocating the site. There is a significant amount of demolition to be undertaken and inevitably contamination to remediate. Delivery of any employment at this site to be hugely optimistic. The Viability Appraisal shows a net Viability Margin of -£16.35m when assessed against CIL. The Council should not rely on employment delivery from Cottam Power Station.	The regeneration of the site is considered a Council priority in the latest Council Plan. To demonstrate sustainable development, regeneration of the site must be supported by appropriate evidence that will ensure any likely impacts from the site, including on highways, infrastructure and the local community can be suitably mitigated. It will also ensure that all infrastructure required in support of the development is provided. The Local Plan identifies the site as a priority regeneration area, but this is now considered a "broad location" for redevelopment rather than an allocation which means that more evidence and detail is needed to demonstrate the site is deliverable. Therefore the site is not required to be developed in this plan period, but can come forward if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated otherwise.