

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead Junction			
1195216	Resident	Why are you proposing to destroy green fields at Appley Head when alternatives are available	The Local Plan makes good use of previously developed land. But unfortunately there is not enough suitable, available and deliverable sites available to meet the Local Plan's needs. This means that some greenfield land is required.
1195486	Gamston with Eaton and West Drayton Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed industrial development between Appleyhead and Wilkinson's needs to maintain the natural feel and approach by ensuring that the site is developed behind the current tree line and this area will be safeguarded as a nature corridor and protected as indicated in the plan - this not clear. 	Thank you for the comments. The trees at the front of the site are protected as a Local wildlife Site so will be protected and incorporated into the design of the development.
REF198	Consultant	Policy 9 page 61 Firstly, the heading to this policy should have ST as it is a Strategic Policy. Secondly, in terms of employment creation, this should be encouraged but not for housing.	Policy ST8 is the strategic policy that addresses the topic of strategic employment. As Policy 9 is a site specific policy it is not considered to be strategic. Apleyhead Junction is for employment not housing.
REF201	Severn Trent	SEM1 is located within a within Source Protection Zone (SPZ), please refer to Protection of Groundwater sources section of our response. Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to highlight the need for sustainable drainage systems to be incorporated, also recommend that the drainage hierarchy is mentioned to ensure that surface water is directed to the most sustainable outfall, whilst also protecting key water resources from harm. Based on the Sites proximity to the Proposed Bassetlaw Garden village, advise that consideration is given on how the developments will impact on each other and the need for watercourses to be protect, and any potentially drainage connections between the two sites are assessed as part of the design process.	Most of the District lies within a Source Protection Zone. Therefore it is appropriate that the water quality and management policy is used as that applies to all development. Support for use of SUDS is welcome. The drainage hierarchy is covered by the water quality policy and SUDS is covered by the flood risk policy. These are strategic policies and apply to all development so there is no need to repeat the text in Policy 9. Local Plan will be amended to ensure the drainage needs of the Garden Village and Apleyhead are considered comprehensively.
REF222	Notts CC	Strategic Highways Part B, 2, a), (i) to (v) The NCC would ask whether these junctions appear on the BDC CIL list. If they do, then would financial CIL contributions would be appropriate. If not then the works (paid for in full by the developer), rather than contributions towards it, would need to be secured through the development. The B6420 Mansfield Road, Morton should be separately identified for route treatment and improvement up to and including the B6420 / A620 junction, see GV comments on this matter too.	Highways requirements will be added to the policy.
REF255	Sheffield City Region	The Draft Plan seeks to provide 108.38 ha of employment land and cater for 5,550 new jobs by 2037. This would make a significant contribution to the economic ambitions of the current SEP in SCR and is in line with our job creation target. The Draft Plan's emphasis on new and developing opportunities such as renewable energies and low carbon technologies is also welcome, reflecting themes in the emerging SEP and the wider need to attract higher quality jobs and opportunities to the city region. Whilst supporting the Draft Plan's overall approach to economic growth, wish to make some specific comments on the linked proposals for a further 199.6 ha of strategic employment land at the Apleyhead Junction and Snape Lane sites. This proposal, and the associated policies in the Draft Plan, reflect the need to be able to accommodate footloose national and regional businesses where this can bring significant economic benefits to a wider area in both the Sheffield and D2N2 City Regions.	Apleyhead does not form part of the general employment land supply. Policy ST6 will be clarified on that basis. Acknowledge that further work with SCR is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. Policy ST8 does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added.
REF256	Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	This is presumably the additional land identified in policy ST6, A2 and policy ST8. If so we would like to see the site specific policy acknowledge this and state that, effectively, this is safeguarded land that does not form part of the employment land supply required to meet identified needs.	Agree. Policy ST6 will be clarified on that basis.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead Junction			
1196860	Sheffield City Council	Paragraphs 5.1.56 and 6.1.8 state that 81 hectares of employment land will come forward. Similarly, Policy ST1C2 states: "b) At least 108ha of new employment land, of which at least 81ha is expected to come forward by 2037; c) At least 199.6ha of strategic employment land to address a sub-regional/regional employment need and/or the significant expansion of a local business." Given the statements above, we consider that there is limited justification within the plan policies to support the need to allocate the additional 199.6 hectares of employment land referred to in policies ST6 and ST8, and the Evidence presented does not support this additional allocation, which therefore constitutes an over-supply. If this additional allocation were to be allowed, it should be strictly controlled to meet a need that could not be accommodated anywhere else within allocated employment sites in the remainder of the Sheffield City Region. Accordingly, we suggest that Policy ST6A2 is amended by adding the following text at the end of the paragraph: "This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement". For the same reason, we would suggest amendments to Policy ST8. Specifically: At the end of B1, add ", Sheffield City Region and D2N2" After B3, the following wording should be added: "This land would only be used for this purpose if there were no other allocated sites within the Sheffield City Region that could accommodate this requirement". Strategic site SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, is not listed in policy ST6 that identifies sites for employment. If this site is intended to meet the additional potential need identified in ST6A2 and ST8 it needs to acknowledge this and state that, effectively, this is safeguarded land that does not form part of the employment land supply required to meet identified needs.	Apleyhead does not form part of the general employment land supply. Policy ST6 will be clarified on that basis. Acknowledge that further work with SCR is needed moving forward in relation to large scale investment at Apleyhead. Following consideration of comments it is not considered that a sequential approach is evidence based and can be justified. Effectively the proposal is requesting that sites in Sheffield City Region be prioritised which is considered to be unjust and without merit. Policy ST8 does require schemes to bring gross value added to the District but D2N2 and Sheffield City Region will be added.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Section 6.4: Site SEM1 Apleyhead Junction is located in close proximity to the Bassetlaw Garden Village adjacent to the A1 and A57 and the site covers 189 hectares. Further clarity regarding pedestrian access, and extending public transport to this site should form part of the transport assessment. Notwithstanding this, the Council along with other South Yorkshire authorities have concerns regarding the proposed strategic employment sites, including SEM1, which are set out at Appendix 1	Agree. A transport assessment has been undertaken in relation to the Garden Village. Connectivity across the A1 and between the sites has been identified.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	This is presumably the additional land identified in policy ST6, A2 and policy ST8. If so we would like to see the site specific policy acknowledge this and state that, effectively, this is safeguarded land that does not form part of the employment land supply required to meet identified needs.	Agree. Policy ST6 will be clarified on that basis.
REF269	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	There is a format error in the document in the last sentence of para. 6.4.3 (p.60 of the document)	Thank you for comments.
REF276	Councillor, Bassetlaw District Council	Site SEM1, Apleyhead Junction is an area which has been seismically tested by INEOS Shale. Should fracking be undertaken then both SEM1 and the Garden Village might be "underfracked" impacting upon the demand for property commercial and residential. The area around and traversing the B6420 has been undermined, no sense in building homes in and around an area that will be under threat from subsidence and induced subsidence if fracking at Apleyhead takes place. The B6420 will need to be beefed up considerably to handle the increased traffic flow from the proposed New garden Village. Who is to pay for that and for improvements to the level crossing needed to deal with that traffic?	There are no plans for fracking to take place at Apleyhead. All highways works and crossing works associated with the Garden Village will be delivered by future developers.
REF282	National Trust	National Trust objects to Policy ST9. In addition, the very high level of transport upgrades proposed in association with this scheme will cause localised disruption while creating a traffic dominated environment. There will also be increased vehicle emissions in an environmentally sensitive area, in particular areas of high value woodland and habitat including the Local Wildlife Site within the site, and Clumber Park located to the south.	All relevant assessments will be undertaken and mitigation secured to ensure that there are no adverse impacts generated by this scheme on the environment. A requirement of the scheme will be to deliver in accordance with a Travel Plan necessary sustainable, active and public transport accessibility. Its worth noting that the move to electric vehicles in general will help address some environmental concerns generated by additional traffic.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead Junction			
REF293 -	The Wildlife Trust	Section 6.4.5 states that 'The development should be seamlessly integrated into the wider landscape and should promote opportunities for biodiversity net gain'. Of the opinion that the wording 'should promote opportunities for biodiversity net gain' is not strong enough. In Paragraph 174 NPPF (2019) the wording is clear and has strong intent. It states 'identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity'. We feel that the text should be amended and replaced with the wording from the NPPF. Quotes NPPF paragraph 174. POLICY 9: Site SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, Worksop a) The protection and enhancement of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site informed by an arboriculture survey and ecological survey; b) Green infrastructure connectivity within the site and to neighbouring green infrastructure assets to support climate resilience; c) An appropriate landscape buffer between the site and the A1 to the east and to the railway line to the north; d) A project level Habitats Regulation Assessment screening in accordance with Policy ST36.	The development would be required to secure at least 10% biodiversity net gain in line with the emerging Environment Bill.
REF300 -	Natural England	Whilst Natural England welcomes the protection in section 3 of the Top Whin Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and recognition of the need for a project HRA, concerned that no mention is made of Clumber Park and the areas designated within it as SSSI within the policy. Note that the SSSI has been mentioned within the Sustainability Appraisal. Suggest that this policy could further promote opportunities for biodiversity net gain. The project level HRA which would be required for this site should include an assessment of all European sites that would potentially be impacted particularly the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC. Please note that Section 3: Landscape, Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure, should be within the green box with the rest of the policy wording.	Appropriate reference to Clumber Park SSSI will be made. Biodiversity net gain will be covered by the biodiversity policy. Impacts on Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC will be properly assessed through the HRA process and the Recreational Impact Assessment.
REF346 -	Doncaster Council	This is presumably the additional land identified in policy ST6, A2 and policy ST8. If so we would like to see the site specific policy acknowledge this and state that, effectively, this is safeguarded land that does not form part of the employment land supply required to meet identified needs.	Agree. Policy ST6 will be clarified on that basis.
REF347	NJL Consulting	The release of land at the A57/A1 junction is supported in principle not least as it meets employment needs. Fundamentally, without an intervention of this nature, it would not be possible to achieve the step change regeneration which is clearly sought by the Council. Welcome the Local Plan and associated evidence which recognises the success of Worksop (the A57 corridor in particular) in delivering significant employment growth, job opportunities and major investment, and noted the potential for a corridor or cluster of similar uses. The cross benefits of such clusters are well established. Whilst there are sites and units for smaller occupiers and 'local market' churn those sites do not meet the requirements for the larger units (particularly of 1 million sqft+). The draft allocated site is a unique opportunity for well-located units that meet the specific requirements of larger occupiers who are often comparing sites on a regional basis. There are no other locations in Bassetlaw, nor indeed within the sub-region, that can deliver the scale or quality of employment land in such an accessible location. Indeed, sub-regionally, this scale of development could only be achieved with sizeable additional Green Belt releases. The benefits can only be realised with a flexible market responsive policy approach that reflects the market's appetite to invest and which does not frustrate the objective by putting in unnecessary barriers. Notwithstanding the general principle support for allocating the site, Caddick is concerned with some of the policy detail at SEM1 Parts 1, 2 and 3 which could create unnecessary policy burdens which inhibit the ability to properly deliver the site within the Plan period. The policy should, instead, contain a flexible and supportive framework for development, with the detail then being addressed in a planning application. For example, Part B 2(a)(i) (Under Transport and Movement) of SEM1 lists a range highways interventions and improvements which would be required for a policy compliant development. Recognise that the scale of development will inevitably require some form of highways mitigation and improvements. However, the Local Plan is not the correct means of requiring these suggested measures. This section of the policy should be revised to set an overarching framework for growth whilst recognising that detail mitigation and management measures would be assessed as part of any forthcoming planning application(s). It is noteworthy that the other local plan 'strategic' employment allocation (SEM2) is not subject to such detailed policy requirements. Supporting text should avoid inferred linkages between the proposed garden village (policy ST3) and the proposed employment allocation. For example,	It is appropriate for a site allocations policy to detail the requirements needed to mitigate the impacts of development over the plan period. Viability testing is focussed on the plan-making stage so it is essential for the Council and its infrastructure partners to know that the infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of a development the scale of Apleyhead can be sought as part of a viable scheme. Highways impacts are amongst those that the evidence base and the Local Highways Authority require to make the site acceptable in planning terms. The same approach is not applied to SEM2 as the site has planning permission and the infrastructure required as a consequence was agreed through that process. The Local Plan does not suggest that the Garden Village requires Apleyhead to sustain its delivery. But both are large scale sites in close proximity and inevitably both will have impacts on similar infrastructure. It is cost effective and efficient to consider the impacts cumulatively so that economies of scale can be achieved to the advantage of both. It is a requirement of national policy that jobs growth and housing growth are balanced. Therefore like all other employment sites Apleyhead is linked to housing delivery.

REFERENCE NUMBER	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS	OFFICER RESPONSE
ST09 - Apleyhead	Junction	<p>paragraph 6.4.2 states the Apleyhead Junction site can boost the housing market, particularly as it will be well connected to the proposed Garden Village. It is important that SEM1 does not infer the employment proposition is somehow linked to the garden village. Fundamentally, delivery of the employment site is not dependant on additional housing growth in the district nor is it tied to the garden village. Furthermore, the supporting text should also not infer the level of contributions needed to mitigate highways concerns. Paragraph 6.4.3 refers to works to the A57 (with reference to the Bassetlaw Transport Study and junction assessment work). However, it is notable that the council's junction assessment work, as part of the local plan evidence base, questions the necessity, viability and deliverability of major A57 works. Paragraph 6.4.5 refers to detailed visual, landscape, biodiversity and lighting matters. It is recognised this is policy supporting text rather than policy itself, nevertheless the text regarding development mitigation should be carefully stated to reflect the scale and nature of development. For example, the paragraph states '...development should be seamlessly integrated into the wider landscape...', yet it is almost impossible to 'seamlessly integrate' an major employment development with circa 25m buildings into an area of limited apparent development (it is noted the existing Wilko and B&Q developments had existing substantial planting on the northern boundary).8.14 The policy supporting text should be updated to reflect the circumstances of the site and requirements of development.30 Suggested policy changes8.15 Caddick suggest the following amended wording to Policy 9.POLICY 9: Site SEM1: Apleyhead Junction, WorksopA. The Council will support the delivery of a strategic employment site at Apleyhead Junction, Worksop, as identified on the Policies Map. The site will be expected to deliver a minimum of 118.7ha of employment land for Class B1, B2 and B8 development within the Plan period (to 2037).B. The development will guide the creation of a sustainable and high quality working environment which will make provision for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Good Quality Design and Local Character) High quality, innovative design which makes the most of its prominent location, adds value to the local area, endures over time and reflects the design principles in Policy ST32 and the Design Quality SPD; b) A layout and design informed by the site context and responds to this context landscape character and ecological value and an archaeological desk assessment, to positively incorporate and enhance on site woodland, hedgerows, biodiversity value and landscape features where feasible and appropriate; c) Energy, water efficiency and sustainable construction to achieve BREEAM very good-excellent standards or any successor scheme; d) A comprehensive sustainable drainage system and maintenance arrangements; e) A suitable lighting scheme that minimises light pollution. <p>2. Transport and Movement) A scheme of an appropriate scale, layout and form supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, and advice of the Local Highways Authority, Highways England and public transport providers, which further details, where feasible:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. A reduction in reliance on motorised vehicles and a step-change towards promotion of sustainable and public transport, including the ii. Provision of suitable footpath and cycle paths that link to the existing network; iii. Safe access to the site from the A57; iv. Contributions to improvements to the roundabout at A57/B6040; v. Contributions to improvements to the roundabout at A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1(T)31 vi. Contributions to capacity improvements at the A57; vii. Appropriate servicing and parking provision for each development parcel; b) impacts of development on air quality through traffic and other emissions are mitigated and an air quality assessment is submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority as part of a future planning application. <p>3. Landscape, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) a) The protection and enhancement management of Top Wood/Great Whin Covert Local Wildlife Site informed by an arboriculture survey and ecological survey;</p> b) Green infrastructure connectivity within the site and to neighbouring green infrastructure assets to support climate resilience; c) An appropriate landscape buffers are considered; between the site and the A1 to the east and to the railway line to the north; d) A project level Habitats Regulation Assessment screening in accordance with Policy ST36. 	
REF401 -	East Markham Parish Council	<p>6.3.6. Apleyhead does form a logical extension to the logistics of the A57 corridor but EMPC is concerned about the impact of any development on existing links and also Clumber Park.</p>	<p>The impact of the development of the site to the A57 has been identified in the Bassetlaw Transport Assessment. It will require appropriate mitigation in the form of access into the site and an improved carriageway on part of the A57. There is no evidence to show that the development of the site will impact Clumber Park.</p>

